

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1861.

ART. I.—1. 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106; 3 and 4 Victoria, c. 86.

2. *A Bill for establishing Diocesan Courts and Courts of Appeal for the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand.* Printed in New Zealand.

3. 3 Burns' *Eccles. Law*, ed. Phillimore, title '*Privileges and Restraints of the Clergy.*'

THE power of the spiritual governors of the Church to enforce her teaching by the exercise of discipline over those committed to her care, is a subject of the deepest interest to the members of a Christian State.

It is a subject which requires, for its due examination, to be considered from various points of view, in order that the confused and loose notions generally prevalent respecting it may be avoided. In a *general sense* this power is obviously inseparable from her existence.

The end of her being, so to speak, is the correction and bettering of mankind; to chasten the vicious, to tame the rebellious, to reclaim the erring, are among the principal objects of her divine institution.¹

To attain these ends she had *within herself* means of great efficacy; she could refuse to the impenitent her ministrations and her sacraments, and as a punishment in the last resort could shut him out altogether in life and death from her communion.

The Apostles who exercised this power transmitted their authority to their successors the Bishops.² The Church, however, as such, could attach no civil penalties or punishments to transgressors; these were *without herself*, and it was but rarely, even after her union with the State, that she invoked in aid of her spiritual censure the secular arm.

¹ S. Matthew xviii. 15—18; 2 Corinth. xiii. 2—10.

² Tit. ii. 15; 1 Tim. v. 20.

It is not, however, with this general view of the authority of the Church to exercise discipline over all *fideles*, clergy and laity, that we are at present concerned. It is the narrower and more confined sense of discipline exercised by the spiritual governors of the Church over her ordained ministers, over the clergy, that we are desirous of now submitting to the consideration of our readers. The authority in this matter belonged, from the very nature and reason of the thing, to the overseers of the Church; it was recognised as so belonging in the laws of the earliest Christian emperors, and has ever continued to be so, with more or less restrictions, in every Christian State.

The sacred character of the priest's office, the unspeakable importance of his duties, the grave consequences resulting from their neglect or profanation, demanded from the bishop a closer and more vigilant inspection into the life of the priest than it was competent or necessary for him to institute into the life of the layman. It was an exaggeration of this reasoning, in itself just, which led to the demand of the spiritual governors of the Church to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over all crimes committed by her ministers. It does not appear, however, from a careful examination of the laws of the first Christian emperors that this demand was ever conceded in its entirety. The tribunals of the State in this early period of Church history reserved to themselves the cognizance of the graver offences against social order committed by ordained ministers of the Church. Nevertheless, this demand on the part of the Church was continually renewed, and continually gaining ground, in spite of some resistance made by the Frank kings and emperors, who instituted (the institution was transplanted into England) a mixed clerical and lay tribunal for this peculiar class of offenders; and in the eighth century the *clericus* was in most Christian States altogether exempted from the jurisdiction of the civil tribunal, and subjected exclusively to that of his Ordinary, a title which comprehended both the bishop and the officers to whom he delegated his authority.

This *privilegium* of the clergy was rendered to a great extent reasonable (and this plea was expressly set forth by the forged Decretals) by the mode of judicial investigation adopted in those barbarous times; the appeal to the *wager of battle*, as a mode of deciding the issue between the litigant parties, was an ordeal to which it was obviously impossible that clerks in holy orders could be subjected. The abuses which this entire exemption of a large and powerful class of subjects from the operation of the criminal law of the State generated during the progress of the Middle Ages, the state of chronic disorder, conflict, and rebellion which it fostered in every community,

and the almost simultaneous abolition of it in every European kingdom, are among the portions of history which are most familiar to the ordinary reader.

The abolition of this privilege, equally pernicious to the clergy and the laity, was quite consistent with leaving the proper jurisdiction of the Ordinary to flow, as in early times, within its natural and legitimate boundaries. But this position, once so simple in reality, and capable of being so simply stated, soon became practically, and has continued to be, one of considerable complication and grave embarrassment.

The Church of the Catacombs, and even the Church of Constantine and Justinian, stood in very different relations with the State from those which subsisted between these two powers in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The change in these relations was a necessary consequence of the constant growth and intertwining of civil interests with the *status* of a large and opulent ecclesiastical corporation.

A spiritual society dependent on voluntary and precarious contributions from the faithful, and a spiritual society endowed and established, and dependent on the civil law of the State for the security of its possessions, were socially and in their bearing upon the temporal government very different institutions. The change affected those within and those without the institution; the clergy as well as the laity. The beneficed clerk was a citizen; the layman was perhaps his relative or his patron. The service of the altar had become a means of temporal support and livelihood which the layman destined one or more of his children to attain, and to which his ancestor had contributed by endowments. The law which governed the clergyman, by the authority of which he was suspended from or deprived of his benefice, became indirectly a matter of interest to the layman; while, on the other hand, the clergyman might sometimes feel a not unnatural desire to appeal from the decision of his Ordinary, which, in the case of deprivation or deposition, reduced him to beggary, to the justice administered by the Crown through the courts in which his fellow-citizens were tried. This feeling would, of course, be much stronger in the case where the Ordinary happened to be a foreigner, and where the ultimate appeal from him lay to a foreign and distant tribunal.

The Crown might, consistently with due respect for the ecclesiastical *status* and law, and with a refusal to adjudicate on the *merits* of an ecclesiastical case, determine nevertheless that justice should be done, and order a new or fuller trial to be had in cases where the clerk complained that justice had not, owing to a defect in the mode of procedure, or some other cause, been done to him.

It is not our purpose to trace the outward development and practical expression of these feelings in the constitutional usages and written laws of the Continental States. Many of our readers will have some knowledge of the struggles between the kingly and papal authorities upon these questions, and especially of the *appellatio ab abuso* allowed by canonists to the Crown; more familiarly known by the practice of France, because the Gallican Church, including clergy and laity, once at least carefully vindicated a claim to the *appel d'abus* as one of its essential privileges and protections against the encroachments of Rome. We purpose to confine ourselves in the remarks which follow, to the operation of these causes upon the question of the Discipline of the Clergy in England.

In England the discipline of the clergy does not appear until a comparatively late period to have excited the jealousy of the laity, or the interference of the civil tribunals. The history of the causes of this jealousy and interference is very instructive, and necessary to be studied by those who would arrive at a just solution of a very difficult problem. During the later period of our Anglo-Saxon history, the bishop and the sheriffs sat together on the bench of the court of the county, and occasionally an ecclesiastical officer exercised judicial functions in the court of the hundred.

The Conquest introduced a change in this respect, remarkable, in the first instance, but of unforeseen moment in its consequences. William granted, as a boon to his Norman clergy, the memorable charter which severed the ecclesiastical and lay jurisdictions, and the effect of which is expressed in the noble language of an early statute of Henry the Eighth, to which attention will presently be drawn. But in the long interval between the reigns of the Conqueror and the eighth Harry, the temporal condition of the Church had undergone an enormous change. The patron who founded, or succeeded to the founder of the benefice, had begun to claim his rights, as well as the clerk who through his presentation obtained institution to and induction into it from the Ordinary. It had begun to be felt that the deprivation of the clerk might indirectly injure, or at least affect, the patron.

But before the full and continually increasing effect of this consequence of endowment be dwelt upon, we must notice a statute passed during the reign of Henry the Seventh. This statute is remarkable on various grounds.¹ It indicates that the spiritual governors of the Church had for the first time found the necessity of applying to Parliament to strengthen their

¹ 1 Hen. VII. c. 4.

hands in enforcing the temporal punishment consequent on the spiritual censure. It is very doubtful whether the provisions of this statute were ever put in ure, and to this circumstance may probably be due the very surprising historical and constitutional fact that the statute continued in force and unrepealed till the reign of her present Majesty.

When the privilege of entire exemption of the clergy in all cases from the jurisdiction of the usual civil tribunals, whether through desuetude or by express law, ceased to exist, the State nevertheless recognised a distinction between offences against the municipal, and offences against the ecclesiastical law, and allowed the latter to be reserved for the cognizance of the tribunals of the Church. It therefore necessarily happened, that in some cases the character of the offence, so to speak, determined the tribunal before which the offender should be tried.

It is obvious, however, that this line of demarcation between the temporal and spiritual tribunals could not in practice be always so sharply drawn as to give exclusive jurisdiction to either. The State might take cognizance of a certain class only of moral crimes, but all moral crimes must be offences against spiritual law. The municipal law, for instance, which punished rape, might leave fornication untouched; but the spiritual law must look upon the former as including, in an aggravated form, the latter crime, and could not abstain from punishing the criminous clerk, because he had also subjected himself to temporal punishment. It might happen, moreover, that the circumstances of the case might render it doubtful, in the first instance at least, which class of crime had been committed.

The *scandal* to the Church required instant *purgation*. Was she not to proceed against her accused minister because, in the course of the judicial investigation, it might turn out that a temporal as well as a spiritual offence had been committed by him? Again, the accused might escape by the aid of some technical flaw the punishment of the temporal law, especially where that law threw every protection which the spirit of mercy and the love of liberty could suggest, around the criminal; but there might be ample evidence to convict him of such scandalous and immoral conduct as to render it imperative upon the Church to eject him from her ministry. Was she to be precluded from doing so because he had been tried and acquitted, howsoever, by the temporal court of the greater offence? The solution of this difficulty has been variously attempted by the laws of various States. It is a satisfactory feature of the English law, that it has always,¹ as

¹ *Burder v. Hodgson*, 4 Notes of Cases, § 487. *Bishop of London v. Bonwell*, 1861.

recently illustrated by the judgment of the Judicial Committee in the case of Mr. Bonwell, recognised the authority of the Church courts to purge the Church of a *scandal*, whether the offence causing the scandal has or has not been cognizable *per se* by those courts.

At the time when the appellate jurisdiction from the Ecclesiastical and Admiralty Courts was transferred to this new tribunal, that part of the jurisdiction which related to the discipline of the clergy does not appear to have, and indeed, we know from a subsequent declaration of Lord Brougham, had not, attracted the attention either of the Legislature or of the Church. Not only did the testamentary and matrimonial jurisdiction form so much the principal part of the business of these courts as to overshadow and almost conceal their jurisdiction over the clergy, but the cases in which this jurisdiction had been exercised were so rare and far between, that it had taken no hold of the public mind. Certainly if the Church and the Government had been wisely advised, the opportunity would have been seized to have reformed and put on a better basis the whole matter of ecclesiastical discipline. However, there was no Cranmer, Stillingfleet, Gibson, or Horsley on the episcopal bench, nor had the mantle of ecclesiastical erudition and knowledge of jurisprudence fallen upon any of the existing governors of the Church; there was no immediate practical pressing grievance on the subject, without the spur of which the English Government or Legislature can rarely be induced to propose and forward any improvement in an existing state of things; though under the influence of that spur they so often act with immature knowledge and a very imperfect foresight of the consequences of the measure which popular clamour compels them to concede.

The state of the law respecting the discipline of the clergy at the beginning of her present Majesty's reign, may be briefly stated as follows:—

A criminal suit against an accused clerk might have been instituted in any consistorial court, but not only in them, but in any archidiaconal court, or court of exempt jurisdiction, to which by ancient papal grant had been committed episcopal jurisdiction.

The appeal from the consistorial court lay to the court of the Archbishop of the province, and from thence to the king in Chancery; that is, to a court of delegates nominated by the Crown under the advice of the Lord Chancellor.¹

The charge or indictment was set forth, as it is now, in

¹ 24 Henry VIII. c. 12; 25 Henry VIII. c. 19.

articles or positions, according to the form of the civil and canon law. The evils attendant on this mode of trial were partly accidental, partly inherent in the system itself. The former, however, presented the most serious obstacle to the due administration of justice.

The Consistory of the Bishop was presided over by a Chancellor, who united in himself the functions of Vicar-General and Official Principal. These offices have, it is believed, never been severed since the Reformation. In recent statutes the term Chancellor is generally used, but in the Clergy Discipline Act the term Vicar-General occurs. This officer was presumed to be, and ought to have been, according to the law of the Church, if not according to the law of the land, a person well skilled in the jurisprudence which he had to administer. Such has always been the Chancellor of London; but unfortunately, the Bishops of other dioceses had, in many cases, considered the office of chancellor as a piece of patronage, to which any person who had taken the degree of Master of Arts might be preferred. The consequence was, that when a serious case affecting the character and position of a clergyman required investigation, the unfitness of the tribunal was painfully obvious, not only to the accused, but to the judge himself. The only remedy was to send the case by letters of request to be tried in the first instance by the judge of the provincial or archiepiscopal court,—a remedy which weakened, indeed practically to a great extent abrogated, the direct authority of the Bishop over his clergy.

But there were other evils inherent in the system itself; the extreme tardiness and cumbrousness of the forms of procedure, the long depositions taken down in writing, the consequent heavy expense, the delay arising from the variety of tribunals (for we have in the foregoing remarks spoken only of the consistorial court), conspired to render the punishment of a delinquent clerk an achievement of great cost and difficulty, and to furnish a large amount of practical impunity to all but very gross and scandalous criminals. This undesirable state of things was further promoted by a general laxity of religious and moral tone, in some degree also by the interposition of the secular courts by writ of prohibition,¹ and by a generally diffused feeling—it could hardly be called a positive conviction—

¹ Latterly this sometimes happened from the fact that the temporal court decided without hearing civilians, upon the principles and precedents which had warranted the sentence of the ecclesiastical judges. Much depended on the stock of general and ecclesiastical jurisprudence possessed by the chief of the temporal court. Lord Campbell granted much fewer petitions than his predecessor, Lord Denman.

that the *freehold* was the principal, and the *cure of souls* the secondary element in the *benefice* of a clerk in holy orders.

In the year 1840 an attempt was made to remedy this disorder in the Church. It resulted in the passing of the present Clergy (inaccurately termed 'Church') Discipline Act, the *Third and Fourth of Victoria*, chapter eighty-six.

The Act had a very stormy passage through Parliament. The late Bishop of London and the Bishop of Exeter differed widely from each other as to the principle upon which such a measure should be founded. The former was eager for a reform which would expedite and cheapen the trial of criminous clerks, and characteristically intolerant of any obstacle which was interposed between him and the attainment of an object of the excellence of which he was convinced.¹ This prelate, so admirable as a preacher and a speaker, so full of energy and earnestness, nevertheless was a dangerous pilot in a troubled sea; he looked but little ahead—saw no rocks, he knew no shoals; he was, in fact, but ill-versed in the principles of canonical jurisprudence. The latter was of far riper knowledge on this point, and was anxious, above all things, to maintain the personal authority of the Bishop over his clergy.

The result was a compromise, and the Act bore upon its face some of the marks which are often, though not always justly, said to be stamped upon offspring of this description.

The principal alterations introduced by this statute into the law of clergy discipline were,—

1. Every criminal suit might be primarily instituted in the court of the Archbishop of the province, if letters of request to that court are sent by the Bishop of the diocese in which the accused clerk holds preferment, or if the clerk be unbeneficed, by the Bishop of the diocese in which the offence has been committed. If the Bishop refuse to send these letters of request, then the criminal suit must be founded upon a previous commission issued by the Bishop to five persons, one of whom must be his vicar-general, archdeacon, or rural dean.

The duty of the Commission is to report, 'whether there be or be not sufficient *prima facie* ground for further proceedings.'

2. If they report that there is sufficient ground, the accused clerk may consent to a lawful sentence being pronounced upon him by the Bishop.

This latter provision is in theory, and has been found in practice to be most beneficial to the Church,—it is the most valuable clause in the whole statute. But if the accused clerk,

¹ *Parliamentary Debates*, Third Series, Vols. xxxiv., xxxv. (1836), pp. 998, 1167; vol. xxxv. p. 6.

from whatever motive, good or bad, decline so to consent, the former provision, with respect to the issue of the commission, becomes, as ought to have been foreseen, the fruitful source of confusion, delay, expense, and injustice. In the first place, the *preliminary* inquiry soon became—as was certain to be the case—practically a regular trial; sworn witnesses examined on both sides, advocates heard, judgment given, and yet, technically, it was not a trial, but a sort of bad, irrational, and imperfect copy of proceedings before a grand jury, the usefulness of which, even in its own sphere, is by no means unquestionable.

In the second place, the witnesses were examined *viva voce*, though at the time when the Act passed into law, the appellate court could only proceed by way of written depositions; so that the evidence had not only to be taken twice over, but in two different ways, the inferior being used at the real trial, and the superior at the preliminary inquiry. This flagrant anomaly has, indeed, since been remedied by a recent statute, which Dr. Phillimore brought into the House of Commons, and Lord Brougham into the House of Lords. This statute introduced for the first time oral evidence into the Ecclesiastical courts.

The practical effect of this statute has been to assimilate the procedure of the ecclesiastical to that of the temporal court; and, as the former tribunal has comparatively few cases brought before it, to decide them with greater rapidity than the former. Still, great mischief ensues from this *preliminary inquiry*; the depositions taken by the commissioners are to be filed in the registry of the diocese, but they are not to be used as evidence if the cause proceeds—in this case witnesses must be examined *de novo*, and the accused clerk, if he be guilty, is apprised of the evidence which presses most heavily against him, and, if he be unscrupulous, endeavours, of course, to get rid of that evidence before the real trial comes on. In truth, the preliminary inquiry *per se* is in every way objectionable and mischievous; the indirect advantage, which has been referred to, of allowing the accused to confess, and the Bishop to pass sentence without further trial, has no necessary connexion with this preliminary inquiry, and might easily, if that were abandoned, be retained.

3. We have now to consider the next step after the inquiry; and here we find a material, and, in spite of deficient and careless provisions, loosely and uncertainly expressed, a beneficial change in the law. The Bishop may either proceed to try the accused clerk himself, with three assessors, two of whom must be a lawyer of a certain standing, the dean of the cathedral, or an archdeacon, or a chancellor of the diocese, not a lawyer.

Where the chancellor is legally qualified, he would, of course, be the principal assessor, or the Bishop may then, as he might before the inquiry, send the case to the court of the province. In only one instance has the former course been adopted, however, and then under the pressure of a *mandamus*, namely, in the case of the Archdeacon of Taunton; and though that be a most unfortunate precedent, it nevertheless established what had been previously doubted, the power of the Bishop, even under the imperfect machinery of the statute, to sit in person with assessors and try causes of correction of clerks.

4. Another change in the law, concerning the advantage of which very different opinions prevail, was effected by a clause, which provided that after the lapse of two years no clerk should be prosecuted for an offence committed before the beginning of that period.

By the former law, and by the canon law generally, no such limitation is prescribed, though the length of time would, upon general principles, have been considered favourably to the criminal.

The precise limitation is open to many and grave objections; but having once been embodied in a statute, it will not easily be abandoned in any future measure. We are inclined to think that if a discretion had been left to the Ordinary, whether after the lapse of two years he would allow a prosecution to be instituted, perhaps the law would have been better adapted to the peculiar exigencies of the case, and that mercy to the individual, and justice to the Church, would have been better reconciled.

5. With respect to the important question of the Appellate Court, the statute made an alteration, which, in our opinion, however well intentioned, was conceived with little wisdom or foresight, and has been, under the semblance of a boon, an injury to the Church. This subject will presently be more fully discussed.

It ought to be noticed here, that the earlier statute of 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106, is, in some sense, also a Clergy Discipline Act, because, though professing to be an Act 'to abridge the holding of benefices in plurality, and to make better provision for the residence of the clergy,' and though known by the popular title of 'the Curates Act,' it provides (sec. 31) for the suspension and deprivation of spiritual persons illegally trading; and by sections 32 and 114, for the infliction of severe pecuniary penalties on non-resident Incumbents; and (sections 54—58) for the sequestration of benefices, and, in the last resort, for the deprivation of the beneficed clerk. It is one of many proofs of the slovenly character of ecclesiastical statutes, that

the framers of the 3d and 4th Victoria, c. 86, appear to have forgotten, or to have been ignorant of, the existence of the above-mentioned provisions in the 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106. Accordingly, a case was ordered in three different courts before it was determined that the provisions of this statute were not by *necessary implication* repealed by those of the 3d and 4th Victoria, c. 86.¹ The loose and doubtful language of this statute has induced, perhaps rendered necessary, several lawsuits for its explication, and has recently raised the very curious and very important question as to the right of the curate, like any other *clericus*, to appeal in the last resort to the Crown,² from an act of his Diocesan depriving him of his *sustentatio* and injuring his character.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have decided that no such right of appeal is given by the statute of 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106.

Nevertheless, it is manifest that a *civil* statute ought not to be made the instrument of *criminal* punishment; and the clauses in the 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106, which have this effect, ought, in any future reform of the law, to be included in the penal statute.

To return, however, to the consideration of the 3d and 4th Victoria, c. 86. Probably no statute, except the famous Statute of Frauds, has ever been the subject of so much litigation³ in so short a period. The meaning of its most important provisions has at last been settled, at the cost, indeed, of much labour, delay, and expense, by the judgments of various tribunals, ecclesiastical as well as civil.

The meaning of these provisions, however, has at last been settled; and settled, on the whole, in a manner and sense conducive to the ends of justice and to the maintenance of discipline over the clergy.

These are points which should be well considered by those who desire fresh legislation on the subject. It may be that they are not aware how much of primitive and Catholic discipline has been gained, and how much may be lost. Perhaps the most important illustration of this observation is furnished by the recent decision of the Queen's Bench, in the case of Mr. Golightly against the Bishop of Chichester.

¹ *Bluck v. Rackham*, 1 Robertson, 367; 5 Moore's Privy Council Report, 305.

² *Poole v. The Bishop of London*, before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. 1861.

³ See particularly, *Homer v. Bloomer and Jones*, IX. Jurist, 167. *Head v. Sanders*, 4 Moore's Privy Council Cases. *Bishop of Hereford v. Thompson*, 2 Robertson, 595. *Ditcher v. Denison*, and *Denison v. Ditcher*, before the Archbishop at Bath, in the Queen's Bench, in the Court of Arches, in the Privy Council.

Mr. Golightly contended that anybody in or out of the diocese might compel the Diocesan to allow *his office to be promoted*; that is, in plain language, to allow a criminal suit to be instituted against a clergyman charged with holding heretical doctrines. That the Bishop had no discretion to exercise in the matter—that he had no right to say, ‘I will not allow the peace of my diocese to be disturbed by every foolish fanatic in the kingdom. I am of opinion that evil and not good would result to my diocese in particular, and to the Church at large, from allowing this suit to proceed. The *cura curarum animarum* is committed to me, not to you; I have the responsibility, and corresponding authority.’

The Queen’s Bench, however, fully approved of this reasoning, refused the writ of *mandamus* applied for by Mr. Golightly, and condemned him in the costs of his experiment. This decision was given upon the construction of certain words in the statute, as well as upon the general ecclesiastical law. The true importance of it can only be estimated by those who knew how much doubt, strange indeed to say, previously existed upon the point; and that Dr. Lushington, in the case of *Ditcher v. Denison*, had arrived at a directly opposite conclusion. The last mentioned case was so fruitful in litigation, that it led to a final construction upon the most important clauses of the statute.

It is only necessary to mention here that, in the course of the proceedings in this case, it was fully established that every Bishop is now, at least, empowered and enabled to try himself, in the first instance, every accused clerk in his own diocese; a power which, though theoretically maintained through the agency of their consistorial courts, had practically been lost to them, except as to sentences of deprivation, since the Reformation. It is reported that Lord Stowell, when Chancellor of the Diocese of London, an office on which his abilities and attainments shed great lustre, said one day to a person talking to him on the restraint practically imposed on Bishops by their own consistories, ‘We have got them out, and let us keep them out.’ Yet Lord Stowell was deemed the model of a lay-churchman of his time; nor is there any doubt that, if in his day the questions of doctrine, discipline, and ritual of the Church had been agitated as they have been of late years, he would have brought to the treatment of these subjects the same stores of erudition and jurisprudence, the same faculty of acute and wise application, the same beautiful robe of perspicuous language, which have immortalized his judgments on the law of marriage and of nations. Probably the remark of this great judge was prompted by a conviction of the inability of a

Bishop sitting alone, and unaided, to administer justice in complicated cases of fact, and requiring a full knowledge of the peculiar laws of evidence, and did not apply to the scheme of the present statute, which provides that the Bishop should sit aided by competent assessors. It is, therefore, a very grave question whether at the present moment any attempt should be made to effect a further reformation of the law relating to the discipline of the clergy, even though it be conceded that upon several points a reform be desirable.

Convocation, let Churchmen remember, is still practically weak, not only in its actual power, but in its moral influence; any measure of the kind must pass through Parliament. Is it probable that any measure recognising the fair and just claims of the Church will pass through that ordeal and become a statute? Are the Bishops agreed among themselves in the Lords? What sop is to be given to the Cerberus of Exeter Hall? He knows little of the existing state of Parliament, and, alas! of politics, who is ignorant that no measure recognising the authority of Catholic antiquity will pass the Commons without receiving in its passage a strong infusion of the most acrid and illiberal Puritanism.

What became of the Colonial Church Bill? Where is the Bill for removing the disgraceful and most illiberal restrictions which fetter and stigmatize the Scotch Episcopalian Clergy in England? What made the Scotch Presbyterian members commit the gross inconsistency of voting with the English radicals against church-rates in England, while practically they were maintaining in Scotland the same impost in a manner which would not, *upon their own principles*, bear half an hour's examination and argument? Think of the fitness of a Committee upon a question of Clergy Discipline, composed, *inter alios*, of Messrs. Bright, Kinnaird, Maguire, and Rothschild, even with the addition of Mr. Horsfall? Let, we say, sober-minded Churchmen, clergy and laity, reflect upon the actual existing state of things before they urge the introduction of another act of parliament affecting the vital interests of the Church. Surely, if ever lessons were written for our learning, they are written in the history of recent Parliamentary legislation for the Church. It is a chapter upon which much might be usefully written. Those who have penetrated beneath the surface of things, those who have read and thought on the subject, know how much of her troubles the Church owes to the haste, ignorance, and good intentions of those who sought to cut, by the aid of Parliament, the knot which they had not patience, learning, or wisdom, to untie.

Little did these worthy and well-intentioned persons dream

that the principle they were unwittingly introducing into a statute would derange the most valuable parts of the jurisprudence which remained. How often, when this unexpected result appeared from the decision founded on the statute of a court of law, have we heard the cry, 'We never intended this!'

We have thought it our duty to offer these admonitory words to our readers; but we cannot close this review without some observations both as to the principle upon which any further reformation of the discipline of the clergy should be proposed, and without glancing—we have not space for more—at some of the principal features which ought to characterise any new measure.

As to the first, our readers will perhaps have anticipated our opinion. The only safe principle upon which ecclesiastical or civil reform can be founded is, that an examination should be made into the original character of the institution, especially with the object of ascertaining whether at one time the ends of it were fulfilled, and whether it be practicable at all, and how far, to revert to that system which once worked well, but which has, during the change and chances of its existence, become inefficient. If by removing the rust and impediments, the growth of causes foreign to the institution itself, that institution can be restored, make the attempt; and—most emphatically in matters relating to the Church—avoid experiments and believe experience. Since 1830, at least, we have learnt the consequences of reforming on a theory alien to the character of the institution to be reformed. You make a new institution, and are surprised to find that it lacks the unperceived but real advantages, the silent harmony of action, so to speak, with the rest of the system, which, till you lost them, you did not recognise in the old machine.

Let us proceed to apply these general remarks on the principle of future reform, and to unite them with some notice of the leading features which ought to characterize it.

The Church has within itself a machinery in harmony equally with the Reformation and Antiquity, capable, if properly repaired, animated, and restored, of discharging satisfactorily and expeditiously, the duty of enforcing this discipline of the clergy. There is by the law of England, incident to every Bishop, a Consistory. It is competent to every Bishop to make that Consistory, if it be not so already, the effectual means of aiding him in this arduous matter of the discipline of his diocese. By the recent statute,¹ this court has the power

¹ 17 & 18 Victoria, c. 47.

of hearing causes *viva voce*, and of proceeding, as it has recently done in several instances, with the same expedition as any ordinary magistrate. Here is an institution in accordance with the general law of the Church, requiring only to be purged of its abuses, and to be properly put in motion. The president of this court ought to be a good lawyer and a good Churchman. If, with his aid and assessorship, the Bishop tried, as he may now do, in person, the more arduous and important cases, delegating to his chancellor the investigation of the class of cases of which a Bishop might naturally desire to dis-embarrass himself, good order might be obtained now without the danger and uncertainty of a measure the fruit of parliamentary interference.

We must now approach the much vexed question of the means by which the expenses connected with the discipline of the clergy are, whether under the present or under new tribunals, to be defrayed. This question divides itself into two branches. First, the question of the costs incident to the suit; and, secondly, the question of the expenses incident to the maintenance of the tribunal. This subject is one which appears to press most forcibly upon the minds of some men; and without conceding to it the place of importance so ascribed to it, we fully admit that it deserves, upon both points, serious consideration.

First, *as to the costs of the suit.*—At present, if the Bishop or the promoter of his office succeed in the suit, and the defendant be punished by *suspension ab officio et beneficio*, the costs can be recovered by sequestration of the living; but if the defendant be punished by *deprivation*, or if he have no benefice, no costs can be recovered, unless the defendant happen to possess a private fortune. It is sometimes said that the English Bishop is so well paid that he may well afford to pay the costs of such occasional suits, and that their large incomes are awarded to them in order to leave a margin for such contingencies. We do not deny that the English Bishops are liberally endowed; but we doubt whether any dispassionate inquirer who duly considers the social position which they necessarily occupy, the many and increasing loud demands upon their charity, the absence of any fund to repair the inevitable dilapidations of the palaces attached to their sees, and the usual expenses of a family, would be of opinion that the costs of such occasional suits ought to be superadded. Nor is it desirable that the consideration of increasing private expense should influence or tempt the Ordinary in the discharge of his duty to the Church; and what duty more imperative than the prosecution of a delinquent clerk? But

from what source can a fund be derived applicable to this purpose? Certainly not from the public treasury. It appears to us that there are but two available sources; one from the sequestration of the living itself, in cases of deprivation, leaving, according to the existing law in cases of *suspension*, provision for the maintenance of a curate. The patron would have no solid ground of objection to this law, because, in the first place, he has partly caused the necessity himself by the presentation of an unfit clerk; and in the second place, his right of presentation again accrues to him, which it might never have done but for the removal of the clerk. Nevertheless, this proposal would probably be opposed by lay-patrons.

The parishioners would certainly be without the advantage incident to the expenditure among them of a larger income by their pastor; but they would be relieved from the ministrations of polluted hands, and the cure of their souls—an evil which can scarcely be overstated—would not be committed to a wicked priest. This last mentioned source does not, it will be observed, supply funds for the punishment of a delinquent but unbeneficed clerk, whom it may be necessary to degrade or depose from his ministry. The other source from which costs might be obtained, is from the funds of the Church herself, now in the hands of the anomalous and costly corporation called the Board of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

The consideration of the propriety of laying the burden of the costs of these suits upon this board, is connected in principle with the second part of this subject, namely, *the expenses of maintaining the necessary tribunal*. The remuneration of the chancellor and registrar of the Bishop's court is at present entirely derived from fees, since the abolition of the Testamentary jurisdiction, upon licences and other ecclesiastical instruments, and from fees paid by parishes at triennial visitations. This source of emolument is bad and uncertain—a proper substitute for it would be a boon to the clergy, the laity, and the ecclesiastical officers themselves; that substitute ought not, however, any more than in the case of the costs of a prosecution, to come from payments made (unless temporarily) by the State, but from the proper revenues of the Church. The haste, fear, and superficial acquaintance with the system and needs of the Church, which characterised the early history of the Ecclesiastical Commission, are in no particular more evident than in the entire omission to make any provision out of the suppressed revenues of cathedrals for the maintenance of the discipline of the clergy. Yet the means of attaining this object, of primary importance to the Church, was a most legitimate charge upon

her proper revenues. In some places, it may be observed, the chancellor of the diocese has *stallum in choro* by the statutes of the Cathedral. If the offices of chancellor and registrar be intrinsically useless, incapable of being improved or turned to good account, let them be abolished; but if they are the contrary, why should another tribunal be established? But whatever be the tribunal the cost of it must fall upon the Church. It might be no inequitable or unwise arrangement if the State were to lend funds to the Church for this object, taking security for repayment from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, whose revenues must ultimately, and at no very distant period, be ample for this object. But eventually the Church must, in the temper of the present times, and in our opinion ought, to furnish the means of defraying the expenses incident to the maintenance of her own discipline. Indeed, this claim upon the ecclesiastical revenues has been very recently recognised by the Legislature in the case of Ireland, the Irish Ecclesiastical Commissioners having been empowered to pay the chancellor and registrar of combined dioceses.

In the meanwhile, one of our most interesting colonies, in which Church principles have struck their roots deep, is herself occupied with the consideration of the subject of this review. New Zealand has prepared "a Bill for establishing Diocesan Courts, and Courts of Appeal for the branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand," which we have now before us.

This bill is indeed little more than terms of agreement, a kind of concordat between the clergy and laity of the Church in the colony, as to the mode in which the discipline of the Church shall be exercised, as at present this agreement cannot be clothed with the character of a statute sanctioned by the State.

It is, however, very instructive to us in Old England to observe what measures a church of Englishmen in a new country, unfettered by acts of parliament, judicial decisions, or precedents, wishes to adopt for the purpose of enforcing spiritual discipline. We have thought the whole paper in this view so interesting, that we have appended it as a note to this article. It will be seen that it provides for a legal Chancellor of the Diocese, a legal Advocate of the Diocese, and a kind of jury, four, two clergymen and two laymen, who are to be assessors to the chancellor, and are to be unanimous in their verdict on the facts before sentence can be passed. There is to be one appeal upon points of law and upon points of doctrine or ritual, to the bench of Bishops. The whole question of appeals from the decisions of colonial ordinaries requires careful revision. We are inclined to think that there should be no appeal from the

decision of the Metropolitan of the Colony until the day arrive when there shall be again a general council of united Christendom. This is, however, a subject which would lead us far beyond our present limits. To return to our proper theme, namely, the English court, in which the Bishop, aided according to the suggestions which we have made, presided. We are disposed to think that there would be but few appeals, except upon questions of doctrine or ritual, from an episcopal tribunal so organized and so equipped.

The mention of *appeal* brings us, though not immediately, to the gravest part of our subject. We say not immediately, because the first appeal to the Archbishop and his court might be, and indeed is, conducted in entire accordance with the ancient usage of the Church, with the advantage of oral evidence, now invariably introduced into it. It is the ultimate appeal which primitive usage, no less than English justice, demands, which, from the causes already noticed, constitute the real difficulty of the whole matter.

To us it seems that this difficulty is by no means insuperable, requiring only to be encountered honestly, and on principle, to be overcome, not by any elaborate and intricate machinery, which is certain to fall out of gear, but by the consistent application of the true principles upon which Church and State exercise their authority.

Our first proposition is the removal of the three prelates, Canterbury, York, and London, from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. We have already stated that in our opinion their presence, or rather, the presence of one of them, which is generally the case, affords no satisfaction to those Churchmen who desiderate an ecclesiastical tribunal, in no way removes or lessens the grievance of the Church, gives no real strength or force to the jurisdiction, while it tends to perpetuate it.

The anomaly of the Bishop of London sitting upon an appeal from the Archbishop of Canterbury or York is manifestly indefensible; the effect of a decision by a single prelate upon points of doctrine or Church discipline, as a member or assessor to a tribunal, is to leave a rankling sense of injustice in the minds of Churchmen, to destroy the respect and reverence due from the priest to his Ordinary, and to assist the progress both of Rome and infidelity in this realm.

But what remedy is there? The following remedy:—Let the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council sit as a lay tribunal—a better one could not be devised. Let them receive *appellationes ab abusu*, and adjudicate upon all questions relating to the construction of statutes, of which the Rubric is a part, and the facts and evidence of a case of discipline. If a question

of doctrine arises in the course of hearing, either mediately, *e.g.*, as connected with the interpretation of the rubrics, or immediately, let them, as they would be eager to do, follow the analogy of all tribunals when questions of foreign law come before them, merely refer the matter to *experts* in that law, submit a case to the Upper House of Convocation, and require the opinion of the Episcopate thereupon, which would by analogy, and practically speaking, be binding upon them as a decision on the point. It would be difficult to suggest a more reasonable proposition, one more in accordance with the spirit of our institutions, one fairer to all parties, one more likely to reconcile the increasing divisions of Church and State, one more likely, as far as mere human institutions can avail, to produce the blessings of unity and peace. The principal outlines of this reform were sketched by Lord Derby in a speech which he delivered in the House of Lords, bearing every mark of the vigour, and none of the defects, of his character. Never did statesman deliver upon a momentous subject, at a time of great agitation, a wiser or an abler speech¹.

It is scarcely necessary to state that the proposition of submitting the clergy to trial in the ordinary law courts is the one which we do not even discuss. Nobody, we are satisfied, who has ever seriously considered the necessary consequences of such a measure, the degradation which would thereby accrue to the whole order of the clergy, the irreverence and disrespect which it would generate in the laity, would advocate a measure at variance with the whole practice and usage of Christendom. Rather let us put in force the spirit as well as the letter of the English constitution. An unintentional breach in it was confessedly made when, *per incuriam*, as Lord Brougham admitted, questions of doctrine were withdrawn from the Delegates, and submitted, with causes of wills and marriage, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Nowhere is the true voice of our constitution more wisely or more majestically heard than in the noble language of the twelfth chapter of twenty-fourth statute of Henry VIII., with a citation from which we close these observations on the Discipline of the Clergy.

'Whereas, by divers sundry old authentic Histories and Chronicles, it is manifestly declared and expressed, that this realm of England is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and King, having the dignity and royal estate of the imperial crown of the same: unto whom a body politick, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms, and by names of Spirituality and Temporality been bounden and owen to fear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience. . . . The body

¹ *Parliamentary Debates* (Third Series), vol. cviii. p. 331, 1389 (1850); vol. iii. p. 648 (1850).

spiritual whereof having power when any cause of the Law Divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared, interpreted, and showed by that part of the said body politick, called the Spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, which always hath been reputed, and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath been always thought, and is at this hour sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain . . . and the Law Temporal . . . was and yet is administered, adjudged, and executed by sundry judges and ministers of the other part of the said body politick, called the Temporality: *and both their jurisdictions do conjoin together to the due administration of justice, the one to help the other.*

[NOTE.]

THE NEW ZEALAND ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS BILL.

A BILL for establishing Diocesan Courts and Courts of Appeal for the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand.

WHEREAS it is necessary that Courts be instituted in New Zealand, through which the Bishops of the Church may exercise the authority vested in them for the maintenance of sound Doctrine and Discipline, and also Courts of Appeal from the decision of the said Courts :

Be it therefore Resolved by the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand, in General Synod assembled, as follows :

I.—CONSTITUTION OF THE BISHOP'S COURT.

1. There shall be in every Diocese a Court, to be called the Bishop's Court, which shall have and exercise jurisdiction over all persons under the authority of the General Synod, and shall hear and determine all cases in which any Clergyman shall be charged with any of the Offences set forth in the 'Statute of Ecclesiastical Offences, 1862,' and all cases in which any Trustee or Office-bearer of the Church shall be charged with any Breach of Trust or Duty.

2. The Bishop shall from time to time appoint a fit person to preside in the Bishop's Court on the trial of all questions of fact which shall be at issue therein, who shall be called the *Chancellor of the Diocese*, and who shall be removable by the Bishop, upon a Resolution of the Diocesan Synod, but not otherwise.

3. The Bishop shall from time to time appoint a fit person to conduct on behalf of the Church all proceedings which shall be instituted in the said Court, and who shall be called the *Church Advocate of the Diocese*; and also a fit person to be the Registrar of the said Court. The Advocate and the Registrar shall be removable by the Bishop, upon a Resolution of the Diocesan Synod, but not otherwise.

4. The Bishop shall also from time to time appoint, with the concurrence of a majority of both Orders in Diocesan Synod assembled, not less than *five Clergymen and five Laymen*, who shall be called the Assessors of the Bishop's Court, and shall hold their Office for three years. Provided that any such Assessor may resign his Office by letter addressed to the Bishop, or may be

removed for sufficient cause by the Bishop, upon a Resolution of the Diocesan Synod, but not otherwise.

5. Upon the occurrence of any vacancy among such Assessors by death, resignation, or removal, the Bishop shall, with such concurrence as aforesaid, fill up the vacancy forthwith, if the Synod be in Session; or if not, then at the first Session thereafter.

6. Except in cases of Breach of Trust, the said Bishop's Courts shall take cognizance of no accusation which shall not have been preferred within *two* years after the Commission of the Offence complained of.

II.—PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE TRIAL.

7. Any Member of the Church, who shall have signed the Declaration prescribed by the Statute of the General Synod, No. 1, Section 6, having any Charge, cognizable by such Bishop's Court as aforesaid, against any other person under the jurisdiction of the said Courts, shall lay his Charge in writing under his hand before the Advocate of the Diocese in which the accused person shall reside. Such charge shall be in one of the Forms set forth in the Schedule hereunto annexed, or as near thereto as may be.

8. The person preferring the Charge shall also execute a Bond to the Registrar of the Diocese, with two sufficient Sureties to be approved by the said Registrar, in such reasonable Penalty (not exceeding Fifty Pounds) as the said Registrar shall deem sufficient for the security of the person accused, binding the accuser to pay all costs and expenses of such proceedings which he may be ordered by the Chancellor to pay, as hereinafter provided.

9. The Church Advocate shall, within *seven* days after such Charge shall have been laid before him, send a copy of the Charge to the person accused; and, after receiving an answer from him or waiting a reasonable time for such answer, shall select by lot out of the Assessors hereinbefore mentioned, two Clergymen and two Laymen, and shall lay before them the said Charge and the answer thereto (if any) of the person accused. If the said Assessors, or the major part of them, after hearing both parties, or their agents, and their witnesses in closed Court, or after hearing the accuser or his agent and his witnesses, in case the party accused shall refuse to attend, shall decide that no sufficient cause exists for instituting proceedings in the Bishop's Court, the case shall be dismissed. If they shall also pronounce the charge to be frivolous and vexatious, the Chancellor shall, upon the application of the person accused, order his costs, to an amount to be stated in the Order, and not exceeding the Penalty of the said Bond, to be paid by the person by whom the charge was preferred: but if they shall decide that sufficient cause does exist, the Chancellor of the Diocese shall thereupon, upon application made to him by the said Advocate, issue a Citation under his hand requiring the attendance of the accused person before the Bishop's Court, to be holden at such time and place as the Chancellor shall in such Citation appoint. The Chancellor shall also thereupon issue letters to the Assessors aforesaid, summoning them to meet at such time and place: Provided that such Court shall be holden not less than *One* nor more than *Six* Calendar months after the date of such Citation.

10. The Chancellor shall also at the request of either of the parties, issue letters to persons whose evidence may be required at the trial, requesting them to attend at such time and place as aforesaid, and (if necessary) requesting them also to bring with them such books and writings relating to the matters in issue as may be in their possession or power.

11. When any Witness shall be unable to travel by reason of age, sickness, or infirmity, or shall be resident more than fifty miles from the place appointed

for the trial, the Chancellor may at any time after the issue of the Citation, appoint, in such manner and upon such terms as he shall see fit, a Commissary to take the testimony of such witness; and such Witness may be examined, cross-examined, and re-examined by the parties or their agents before such Commissary. The examination shall be reduced into writing and signed by the Witness and the Commissary; and the same shall be forthwith transmitted by him to the Chancellor, and shall without further proof be received in evidence by the Court.

12. Immediately upon the termination of the Preliminary Inquiry before-mentioned, the Advocate of the Diocese shall certify in writing to the Bishop the decision of the Assessors. And in case the said Assessors shall have found sufficient cause to exist for instituting proceedings in the Bishop's Court, it shall be competent for the Bishop to inhibit the person accused from performing the services of the Church or from exercising his office until final judgment shall have been given in the Cause or on Appeal. And in every case, except where the person accused shall be a Trustee of Church Property, it shall be competent for the Bishop to appoint a Substitute to act during the period in which the inhibition shall continue in force.

13. The Charge may at any time, by permission of the Chancellor, be amended in such manner and on such terms as he shall think fit and necessary for the purposes of Justice, provided that the substance of the Charge be not varied by any such amendment.

14. If the accused person shall at any time before the trial, by writing under his hand, confess the truth of the Charge, and consent that the Bishop shall forthwith pronounce Sentence upon him, it shall be competent for the Bishop to pronounce accordingly such Sentence as he shall think fit, not exceeding the Sentence which might have been pronounced if proceedings had gone on in the ordinary course.

III.—PROCEEDINGS AT THE TRIAL.

15. At the time and place fixed for the Trial, the Registrar of the Court shall, in the presence of the Chancellor, proceed to determine by lot the Assessors for the Trial of the cause. Provided that the Defendant shall have the right of challenging peremptorily any two of the Clergymen and any two of the Laymen named by the Registrar at any time before they shall have made the Declaration hereinafter mentioned. But if there be several Defendants they shall not be allowed to sever in their Challenges.

16. If there shall be a deficiency of Assessors, the Chancellor may, with the concurrence of the majority of the Assessors there present and unchallenged, call in the stead of the absent Assessors any Clergymen or Laymen (as the case may be) whom he shall think fit.

17. The first two Clergymen and the first two Laymen who shall remain unchallenged shall act as a Jury on the Trial.

18. Each Assessor shall in open Court, before the commencement of the Trial, solemnly declare, that he will well and truly try the matters in issue in the Cause, and will give a true verdict thereon according to the evidence, without fear, favour, or malice.

19. If the Defendant, having been duly cited, shall fail to appear, either in person or by an Agent, it shall be competent for the Court, if satisfied that his absence is contumacious, to order the Trial to proceed as if he were present.

20. No person shall be allowed to appear as an Agent for the Defendant at the Trial, or as an Agent for either party at the Preliminary Inquiry hereinbefore mentioned, unless he be a Member of the Church who shall have made

and signed the Declaration prescribed by the Statute of the General Synod, No. I. Section 6.

21. Every person who shall be called as a witness, either for or against the defendant, shall, before he give any evidence, make a solemn declaration, that he will speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

22. The evidence shall be taken down in writing by the Chancellor. The Chancellor shall admit any evidence which he shall deem to be relevant to the Issue, subject to the Rules following (that is to say):—

a. No Witness shall be allowed to testify as to any of the matters in controversy from information given to him by any other person; but he shall testify only so far as the said matters shall be within his own personal knowledge.

b. Oral evidence shall not be received as to the contents of any document, in any case where the party tendering such evidence can produce the document itself, or cause it to be produced.

c. No copy of any document shall be received in evidence, in any case where the party tendering the same can produce the document itself, or cause it to be produced.

23. The Court shall be open to the public, unless the Chancellor, with the concurrence of the major part of the Assessors, shall deem it expedient to close it, on account of the matter of the inquiry, or misconduct of the audience, or any other urgent reason. In case the Court shall be ordered to be closed, each of the parties may have as many as six male Members of the Church (who shall have signed the Declaration so prescribed as aforesaid), chosen by himself, to form an audience.

24. The Chancellor may from time to time adjourn the Court, as he shall see fit, whether there be any Assessors present or not.

25. The Assessors, after hearing the Church Advocate, and the defendant or his agent, and their witnesses, and after the case shall have been summed up by the Chancellor, shall consider the evidence and deliver their verdict. If the offence charged against the defendant be any of the Offences specified in the first and second Sections of the "Ecclesiastical Offences Act, 1862," the Verdict shall be a Special Verdict, stating in writing the facts of the case as the Assessors find them to have been proved. In other cases, the Verdict may be "guilty," or "not guilty," or a Special Verdict, as they may think fit. Provided always, that no Verdict shall be given in any case without the unanimous consent of the Assessors.

26. In the case of any Verdict being given other than a Verdict of "not guilty," it shall be competent for either party, within *seven* days after the Verdict is given, to apply to the Chancellor for a new trial on the ground that the Verdict is contrary to the evidence; and if the Chancellor shall see sufficient ground for doubting the soundness of the Verdict, he shall grant a new trial. If there have been several matters in issue, the new trial may be confined to one or more of the issues, if the Chancellor shall see fit.

27. The finding of the Assessors upon the new Trial, or, if no new Trial be granted, then the finding of the Assessors upon the original Trial, shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties as to all questions of fact submitted to the Assessors.

28. In every case except where the offence charged shall be a breach of Trust, the Chancellor shall without delay certify to the Bishop the finding of the Assessors, and shall transmit therewith to the Bishop the original charge in writing upon which the defendant was brought to Trial, together with his own notes of the evidence given at the Trial. If the Verdict be other than a Verdict of "not guilty," the Bishop shall thereupon give notice to the defendant and to the Members of the Court of the time and place, when and where he proposes to pass Sentence; and shall permit all other persons, who

may so desire, to be present thereat. Before Sentence is given, the defendant shall have leave to speak in mitigation of punishment. Thereupon the Bishop shall pronounce Sentence according to the Statute of Ecclesiastical Offences, 1862, or such other Statute as shall be in force in that behalf for the time being.

29. It shall be competent for the Bishop, if he shall see fit, to reserve any question of Doctrine or Ritual for the decision of the bench of Bishops, and to reserve any question which may arise as to the interpretation of any Statute of the General Synod, or of any Diocesan Synod, for the decision of the Standing Commission, or of such tribunal as may hereafter be constituted by the General Synod for that purpose, and upon receiving such decision, to give judgment in accordance therewith.

30. In cases where the offence charged shall be a breach of trust, the Chancellor shall without delay certify to the Standing Commission the finding of the Assessors, and shall transmit therewith to the Standing Commission the original charge in writing, upon which the defendant was brought to trial, together with his own notes of the evidence given at the trial. Whereupon the Standing Commission shall proceed as the nature of the case may require.

IV.—APPEAL FROM BISHOP'S COURT.

31. Whenever the sentence pronounced by the Bishop shall have been founded upon a special verdict, it shall be open to either party to appeal therefrom, as to any matter of Doctrine or Ritual, or as to the interpretation of any statute of the General Synod or of any Diocesan Synod. If the ground of Appeal be a question of Doctrine or Ritual, the Appeal shall be to the bench of Bishops, or to such committee of Bishops as the bench may appoint for that purpose. But until such committee shall be formed, it shall be competent for the bench of Bishops to consider and decide such Appeals without meeting together as a Court for that purpose. If it be a question of the interpretation of a statute, the appeal shall be to the Standing Commission, or to such tribunal as may hereafter be constituted as aforesaid.

32. Provided always, that notice of Appeal shall be given to the Bishop and to the opposite party within *seven* clear days after the delivery of the Sentence. Provided also, that no Appeal shall be allowed in any case unless the party prosecuting such Appeal shall have executed a Bond to the Registrar of the Bishop's Court, with two sufficient sureties to be approved by the said Registrar, in such reasonable penalty (not exceeding Fifty Pounds) as the Registrar shall deem sufficient for the security of the other party, that the Appellant will prosecute the Appeal with due diligence, and pay all costs incurred by such other party by reason of the Appeal, which the Appellant shall be adjudged by the Court of Appeal to pay, in case he shall not succeed in his appeal.

33. The Appeal shall be by suing out letters missive from the Bishop to the Court of Appeal, whereunto shall be annexed a transcript (certified by the Registrar) of the charge and of the proceedings thereon, and of the notes of the evidence taken at the trial: and no other evidence shall be brought or received before the Court of Appeal.

34. The Sentence or Judgment pronounced by the Bishop shall not take effect until after the determination of the Appeal.

35. It shall be competent for the Court of Appeal to affirm or to reverse the Sentence or Judgment complained of in the whole or in part, and to make such other Order in the Cause as the said Court of Appeal may deem to be just.

36. Upon the unanimous decision of the Bench of Bishops, or of such Committee of the Bishops as aforesaid, that the Doctrine complained of is directly contrary or repugnant to any of the said *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*,

or that the Practice complained of is directly contrary or repugnant to the authorized Practice of the United Church of England and Ireland, the Judgment appealed from shall be confirmed or reversed, as the case may require, or if no Sentence shall have been passed, Sentence shall be passed accordingly. If the Bench, or such Committee as aforesaid, be not unanimously of opinion that such Doctrine or Practice is repugnant as aforesaid, the Judgment shall be for the defendant.

37. In all cases not involving questions of Doctrine or Ritual, judgment shall be given for the appellant, unless a majority of the Members of the Court of Appeal be of opinion that the Judgment pronounced by the Bishop ought to be sustained.

V.—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

38. Any Member of the Church who shall have signed the Declaration prescribed by the Statute aforesaid, having a Charge against any Bishop of the Church, may prefer the same in the Diocesan Court of the Metropolitan, or (in case the Charge be against the Metropolitan) in the Diocesan Court of the senior Bishop other than the Metropolitan; seniority being counted from the day of Consecration. The course of proceeding in such cases, and on appeal from the sentence of the Metropolitan or senior Bishop, shall be the same as in ordinary cases, or as near thereto as may be, save only that the Assessors on the Preliminary Inquiry shall be the Metropolitan or such senior Bishop, together with two Clergymen and two Laymen, and also that (if a Trial of any issue of fact shall take place) the Assessors, who shall act as a Jury on the trial of such issue, shall be two Bishops, two Clergymen, and two Laymen.

39. No Clergyman, Trustee, or other Office-bearer, appointed under the authority of the General Synod or of any Diocesan Synod, shall be removed from his office before his term of Office shall have expired, without his own consent, except upon a decision of such Tribunal as is herein constituted; unless it shall have been expressly provided that he may be so removed by the terms of his appointment, or by any Statute of the General Synod.

40. It shall be competent for the Standing Commission from time to time to make all such rules as may be necessary for regulating proceedings in the Courts herein constituted, and to alter or rescind the same. Provided that the same shall not be repugnant to any of the provisions herein contained. All rules so to be made shall be laid before the General Synod at the Session next after the making of the same.

41. In the interpretation of this Statute, the term "Office-bearer" shall include all Clergymen, Trustees, Catechists, Churchwardens, Schoolmasters, and Agents of any kind appointed by or under the authority of the General Synod, or of any Diocesan Synod; the term "Bench of Bishops" shall mean all the Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of New Zealand; and the term "Church" shall mean the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand.

SCHEDULE.

FORM 1.

I, A. B., of _____, a Member of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand, do hereby charge and aver that C. D. _____ of _____ being a Minister of _____ did on _____

or about the _____ at _____ in the _____ [*stating particularly and clearly the Offence charged*] contrary to the Provisions of the Statute of Ecclesiastical Offences, 1862: on which Charge I desire that the said C. D. be duly brought to trial. And I solemnly declare that I believe the Charge hereinbefore laid to be substantially true.

A. B.

FORM 2.

I, A. B., of _____ a Member of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand, do hereby charge and aver that C. D. of _____ being an Office-bearer of the said Branch of the Church, that is to say, being _____ did on or about _____ at _____ in the _____ [*stating particularly and clearly the Breach of Duty charged*] contrary to the Provisions of the Statute of Ecclesiastical Offences, 1862: on which Charge I desire that the said C. D. be duly brought to trial. And I solemnly declare that I believe the Charge hereinbefore laid to be substantially true.

A. B.

FORM 3.

I, A. B., of _____ a Member of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand, do hereby charge and aver that C. D., being a Trustee for and on behalf of the General Synod of certain Lands situate at _____ under and by virtue of a Deed bearing date _____ did on or about the _____ at _____ in the _____ [*stating particularly and clearly the Breach of Trust alleged*] contrary to the Trust expressed and declared in the said Deed: on which Charge I desire that the said _____ be duly brought to trial. And I solemnly declare that I believe the Charge hereinbefore laid to be substantially true.

A. B.

ART. II.—1. *Die Sibyllinischen Weissagungen vollständig gesammelt; nach neuer Handschriften-Vergleichung, mit Kritischem Commentare, und metrischer Deutscher Uebersetzung.* Herausgegeben von DR. T. H. FRIEDLIEB, Professor an der Universität zu Breslau. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel. 1852. 8vo. pp. lxxxv. 232. cxxiv.

2. *Χρησμοὶ Σιβυλλιακοί: Oracula Sibyllina: Textu ad Codices MSS. recognito: Maianis supplementis aucto: cum Castalionis versione innumeris pæne locis emendatâ, et, ubi opus fuit, suppletâ: Commentario perpetuo: Excursibus et Indicibus.* Curante C. ALEXANDRE. Parisiis: Firmin Didot. 8vo. Volumen Primum, 1851, pp. lxxviii. 302. Volumen I. Pars II. 1853, pp. xvi. 260. Volumen alterum, 1856, pp. 624. 82.

THE Sibyls! Familiar as is the name to us, how little we realize the place which they occupied in the Christian Mythology of the Mediæval Saints! How difficult to feel that ages which received the Decretals, received also the pseudo-prophecies of Sibyllic composition with unbounded faith—received them, fed on them, built on them! And yet we doubt whether there are many English scholars who have ever read them through, while their sublime poetry is all but unknown to ordinary students. Till lately, the huge compilations in which alone the *χρησμοὶ* were to be procured, rendered such ignorance more excusable. But Dr. Friedlieb's reprint, however grave its faults, at all events made the study of the Sibylline fragments open to all. And now M. Alexandre has produced a work which has fully exhausted the subject. His good taste, his learning, his grasp of his matter, his appreciation of the place which the Sibylline poems held in the centuries before our LORD—in primitive and in mediæval times—render his work the best French edition of a Greek book which it has ever been our lot to see.

We are to regard the Sibylline Oracles as a text-book of Prophecy for early and mediæval times; and as such we proceed to consider them.

Dies ire, dies illa
Solvat seclum in favillâ
Teste David cum Sibyllâ

It pleased the French Reformers of the Breviary to alter the two last lines after this fashion :—

Crucis expandens vexilla
Solvat seculum in favilla.

But the original reading gives a far better idea of the influence which the Sibylline Oracles exerted over the whole of mediæval lore. To those ages it seemed nothing wonderful if the GOD Who had inspired Balaam to say, 'I shall see Him, but not now; 'I shall behold Him, but not nigh; there shall come forth a star 'out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall arise out of Israel;' Who had inspired Caiaphas with the declaration, 'It is expedient that one man should die for the people;' that He Who had even put those words into the mouth of Virgil—

Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna:
Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur alto:

that He should have vouchsafed to turn the oracles of darkness into the means of propagating the light. And certainly there are indubitable instances in which the devils, as of old time, confessed Him Whom they equally hated and feared. To say nothing of the tale related by Plutarch—which yet there seems no reasonable ground for doubting—how the pilot Tamois, on the very evening of our LORD'S Passion, was commanded by an aerial voice to proclaim, near the promontory of Phalacrum, that 'Great Pan is dead;' and instantly the whole surrounding atmosphere was filled with the sounds of wailing and lamentation: there are the irrefragable accounts of the cessation of the oracle of Daphne, when the remains of S. Babylas were there interred; and of the oracle which, silenced by S. Gregory's having passed a night in the temple, could not resume its functions till the evil spirit was formally permitted to reassert his ancient power. Let us now, therefore, give a few quotations from the earliest Fathers, which shall show how widely and how deeply the belief in the Sibylline Oracles had permeated the Church. In the first place, there is that passage in the *Similitudes* of S. Hermas, where there appears to the writer an aged woman, in glorious apparel, who begins to read from a volume. And some time afterwards the angel asks:—"The 'aged woman from whom thou didst receive this book: whom 'thinkest thou her to be?" I replied, "The Sibyl." "Wrong," said he; "it is not so." "Who then is she, lord?" said I; and 'he answered, "It is the Church of God." Then, again, we find S. Justin Martyr over and over again quoting the same testimony, and using the witness of the Prophetess in verification of the truths of the Gospel. S. Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch,

in the time of Commodus, in his Apology for the Christian religion to his friend Autolycus, quotes largely from the Sibyl: and with respect to these early apologists one consideration must strike us with great force. Against whatever they said, it was certain that the whole learning and ingenuity of the heathen world would be taxed to discover a reply. What entire confidence, then, must they have felt in the authenticity of these poems, who thus seem to imperil the being of the Christian religion on such an issue! S. Clement of Alexandria cites no less than forty-six verses from the same poems. Origen, however, seems to have had a truer view of the subject. He does indeed maintain the authenticity of the Sibylline writings against Celsus as a matter of argument; but one cannot but feel him to be arguing against his own convictions, on the principle of not yielding an inch of ground to his adversary. And in confirmation of this belief, we may observe that he never quotes the Sibyl but once, and then merely by way of allusion rather than of argument. The same thing may be said of S. Hippolytus; he never makes an absolute citation from the Oracles, though he twice alludes to them; once, in the fifty-second chapter of his work on Antichrist; the other, in his book on the consummation of the world. At the same time, that the ordinary run of the Greek-speaking Christians during the second and third centuries deeply studied, and were entirely imbued with the spirit of, these oracles, is made certain by the fact, that in the third century so many fresh forgeries of the same kind were published; so that, in fact, the more beautiful, and to a certain extent the more valuable, portion of the existing books are to be referred to that period.

But in the Western Church, where criticism was at a much lower ebb, the Sibylline oracles were quoted without any kind of doubt. Let us hear Tertullian: 'I will speak a little more concerning Saturn, and will not omit those testimonies of Divine literature to which so much faith is due on account of their age. The Sibyl, before literature existed at all, speaks thus concerning the birth and the history of Saturn. In the tenth generation, says she, of men, after the Deluge, reigned Saturn, and Titan, and Japetus,¹ the most mighty children of earth and heaven.' He is quoting that which we now read as the 108th verse of the third book. In like manner in his treatise *De Pallio*, he tells us that the Sibyl spoke true with respect to Delos and Samos, in manifest allusion to Book viii. line 165.

Half a century later, Arnobius, in his treatise against the Gentiles, derides the heathen for affirming it to have been by

¹ *Japetus* is a most easy and certain correction for *Jam fatus*.

the inspiration of Apollo that the Sibyl uttered so much truth. In the same century, but later, that most excellent man, and most barbarous poet, Commodianus, transfers some of the Sibyllic rules into his own uncouth lines.

And next we come to Lactantius, who, of all Latin writers, is the most imbued with the spirit of these Oracles. There are in the works of this writer more than seventy quotations from the Oracles; and these of such length, that from them no inconsiderable portion of the present Sibylline writings might be recovered. And it was probably from the works of Lactantius that the Emperor Constantine, in his oration to the Fathers of Nicæa, quoted the Sibyl; and more especially referred to that most touching passage:—

αἱ, αἱ, ἐγὼ δειλὴ, πότε' ἐλεύσεται ἡμᾶρ ἐκεῖνο,

which one cannot but imagine to have been in the mind of Thomas of Celano, in that pathetic verse of the *Dies Iræ*—

Quid sum miser tunc dicturus?
Quam patronum rogaturus?
Cum vix justus sit securus.

And, as we shall have occasion hereafter to show, Constantine dwells on the celebrated acrostich of the Lord's Name, as one of the most convincing proofs of the Christian religion.

If we proceed in ecclesiastical history, S. Cyril of Jerusalem opposes one Sibylline passage to Julian; but, as it will appear, not taken from the original work, but a second-hand quotation from the report which Eusebius gives of the oration of Constantine to the 'Saints.' In like manner, S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, and S. Epiphanius have no reference whatever to the Sibyl; and if S. Gregory Nazianzen alludes to her, it is rather in his character of poet than of bishop. Sozomen, however, quotes one line from the Oracles regarding the Cross:—

ὦ ξύλον, ὦ μακάριστον, ἐφ' ᾧ Θεὸς ἐξεταύσθη.

And it is singular that at an epoch which was supposed to be sinking into darkness, Procopius passes a juster opinion on these Oracles than most of his predecessors. He says that he cannot attach any importance to their prophecies as prophecies, because they seem to have been written subsequently to the events of which they spoke; but that as works of a certain value in their way, he brings forward their testimony.

It is singular to find, in the fifth century, an Armenian author alluding to our Prophetess. Monsieur Alexandre quotes from the Whistons' edition of Moses Khorensis a passage in which that author speaks of the Sibyl. That edition we have not at hand;

but either he quotes, or the Whistons translated, incorrectly. We give the actual sentence from the edition published at the Mekhitarist press in 1841: 'But at first I am glad that I can begin my account from my dear Berosian Sibyl, who is much truer than the greater part of historians. Before the Tower, and the multiplication of languages in the human race, after the navigation of Xisuthris into Armenia, Zerouan, Titan, and Japhetos were princes of the earth. These persons appear to me to be Shem, Ham, and Japheth.'¹

The derivation of the word Sibyl, 'she that hath the counsel of God,'² seems next to certain. The number of the prophetesses honoured³ with that appellation is more doubtful; Varro, who, as cited by Lactantius, was the mediæval authority, mentions these:—1. The Persic; 2. Libyan; 3. Delphian; 4. Cimmerian; 5. Erythræan; 6. Samian; 7. Cumæan; 8. Hellespontic; 9. Phrygian; 10. Tiburtine; and their legends or attributes are usually, in the Cathedrals of the Middle Ages, given as we shall presently notice. Of the lists which *we have seen*—in stalls, in stained glass, in stone sculpture, in rood-screens, or in the illuminations of the huge choir-books—these cathedrals or minsters supply the best examples:—Ulm, in Würtemberg; Ribe, in Jutland; Marieboe, in the island of Falster; Palencia, in Spain; Chaise-Dieu, in Burgundy; Curzola, in the Adriatic island of that name; and Chartres. But Ulm, on the whole, is the best, and we may as well here repeat the prophecies of each Sibyl as there given. When the reader has acquainted himself with the interest of the productions themselves, he will be the more ready to enter into an inquiry as to their date and authorship. We give the names as there spelt; the work dates 1469—1474.

1. *Sibella Eretria*. She holds the famous acrostich, which, on account of its world-wide reputation, it will be proper hereafter to quote. The Ulm version, admirably carved in an oaken scroll against the south pier of the chancel arch, is that of S. Augustine.

We shall have occasion to enter more at length, by-and-bye,

¹ Իսայ ես պիտ' ուրախացայ Հաւ առնելով առաջկույցս իմոց բանից 'ի սիրդն իմեկ և քան զճառս յարգարարեսոյդէ, 'իբրևստեանն Սիրիզեայ. &c.

² Σιδός = θεός. βόλλα or βόλλα = βουλή. No one will now follow the derivation which Pausanias tells us was in fashion at Delphi (Phocæa xii.), that σίβυλλα was a mere metathesis for λίβυσσα.

³ Tacitus says, Annal. vi. 12, 'Quod a majoribus quoque decretum erat, post exustum civile bello Capitolium, quesitis Samo, Illo, Erythris, per Africam etiam ac Siciliam et Italicas colonias, carminibus Sibyllæ (una seu plures fuere) datoque sacerdotibus negotio, quantum humana ope potuissent, vera discernere.' This was in A.D. 32. See Walther, tom. i. 391.

into the subject of this most celebrated acrostich; at present we merely pass on to—

2. The Delphian Sibyl. 'He shall give his back to the strokes, and when he is smitten shall be silent.' (These fragments of prose are not from any of the Sibylline oracles, but from the words of Lactantius, who intends to give their substance.)

3. The Libyan Sibyl. 'He shall take our intolerable yoke on his own neck, and wear it for us.'

4. The Tiburtine Sibyl, called Albuna. 'They shall hang him on a tree, and it shall profit them nothing; for on the third day he shall rise again, and shall show himself to his disciples, and shall be seen by them; he shall ascend into heaven, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.'

5. The Hellespontic Sibyl. (Here we have an attempted translation from the original Greek, and in verse.)

Felix ille Deus ligno qui pendet ab alto.

6. The Cumæan Sibyl, called Amalthea. 'The veil of the Temple shall be rent, and there shall be pitch-black night in the mid-day.'

7. The Cimmerian Sibyl, foretelling to Octavianus that God should be born of a Virgin. (The line of Virgil.) 'Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur alto.'

8. The Phrygian Sibyl, called Antico. 'He shall fall into the hands of the unbelievers, and with wicked arms they shall strike the LORD, and shall with impure mouths spit poisonously upon him.'

These eight are all that seem to have been known to the German architect; for there is no reason why, had he been so disposed, he might not have introduced more. At Marieboe there are, or were, eleven, but probably one had been destroyed. At Ribe there are six Sibyls. In a very exquisitely illuminated manuscript Breviary, now preserved in the Royal Library at Copenhagen, there are sixteen; but evidently with the design of matching each prophet—for all the prophets are in like manner thus represented—with a Sibyl. Each of the latter has a legend, consisting of one hexameter verse, proceeding from her mouth, just as each prophet has his clearest prediction of our LORD attached to him the same way. But, in addition, the Sibyls have each, it would seem, their own peculiar attribute; distaff, spade, wheel, plumb-line, and so on, in a way which the present writer is not able to explain.

We now come to the periods at which the several poems at present joined together in one work, as the Sibylline Oracles, were actually written.

And part of that which is now called the third, has un-

doubtedly the claim to the highest antiquity. Only here we must carefully distinguish between the various parts of that book. They are four in number. The first (ver. 1 to 97) seems to have been a later addition. The second, commencing at ver. 97, extends to ver. 294, and contains an account of the various empires of the Egyptians, Persians, Medes, Ethiopians, Assyrians, and Macedonians. Then there appears to be another long insertion, which extends to ver. 489; and then the fourth part of this book begins, and only ends with the book itself. Without entering deeply into their reasons for so determining, it seems certain that the commentators are right in attributing the older part of this book to the time of Ptolemy Philometor: and, in all probability, to the Jew Aristobulus, the preceptor of Euergetes, brother of Philometor, as we learn from 2 Maccabees i. 10. 'In the hundred fourscore and eighth year, the people that were at Jerusalem, and in Judæa, and the Council, and Judas, sent greeting and health unto Aristobulus, king Ptolomeus' master, who was of the stock of the anointed priests, and of the Jews that were in Egypt.' These parts, therefore, of the third book, are entitled to very considerable authority; an authority equal to that of the Maccabees, and superior to that of the apocryphal books of Esdras. On this subject, no critics have written better than Bleek, Gfrörer, and Chausen.

The commencement of the oldest part, consisting of verses 97—294, and 489 to end, very probably intended to imitate the rhapsodical beginnings of the true Sibyls, opens thus:—

But when the threat of God shall be fulfilled,
The threat pronounced on mortals, when they raised
That unblest turret in Assyria's land—
For of one speech were all; and so they willed
The starry heav'n with vain intent to reach:
Wherefore th' Almighty gave His winds command
And forthwith fell the Tower, so huge, so vast,
And in its builders wild contention reign'd:
And Babel is the name men give their work.
But when that tow'r had fall'n, and human speech
Was cleft to various languages, the earth
Was soon replenish'd with divided tribes,
And parted out 'twixt monarchs. Then at last
Rose the tenth race of men, succeeding that
Whelm'd by the Deluge. Then too Cronus reign'd,
Then Titan reign'd, then reign'd Iapetus,
The offspring of the earth and sky—so men
Gave them their title, making earth and sky
Their parents, for that they were greatest far
Of human progeny:—in threefold shares
They measured out the earth, and each had rule
O'er the third part, peace reigning over all.

The writer then goes on to imitate the Theogony of Hesiod, twisting it without much ingenuity to Scripture history. After running through a considerable portion of the world's annals, the writer says that there is a race

κατὰ χθονὸς Οὐρ Χαλδαίων
Ἐξ ἧς μοι γένος ἐστὶ

of righteous men, who live holily among the gentiles; and, proceeding to describe the Jews, he predicts terrible punishments on other nations, while they shall be restored to their own land:—

καὶ τότε δὴ νὰς πάλιν ἴσσεται, ὥς πάρος ἦεν.

Next in time to the Erythræan Sibyl's prophecies, for to her the third book has, from its superior value, been attributed, comes the fourth book, as we have it now; the fourth, in every recension, except the Munich manuscript, where it is called the tenth. But this is evidently the composition of a Christian, and probably of a Christian Jew. The mixture of past history and future prophecy—the wild fragments so natural in a state of excitement such as those of the early persecutions, gives a lively idea of the immediate expectation which the Christians of the first and second centuries entertained of the coming of Antichrist, and the Advent of the LORD. Thus (book iv. line 137) Antioch is to fall under the arms of Italy, led on by Antichrist; Cyprus, by means of an earthquake, is to be overwhelmed in the sea; an inundation of the Meander is to destroy the inhabitants of Caria; and all these things are but the precursors of the final judgment. This book is undoubtedly the most interesting to the ordinary student; and is absolutely necessary to be read by those who would form an idea of the hurried life of excitement in which the most primitive Christians lived,—so different from the calm, quiet repose in the overruling providence of GOD, which our fancy is apt to attribute to them.

We may observe that our poet was not a millenarian—which, at the time of Titus or Domitian, in which this book was undoubtedly written, is worthy of notice. Let us give a specimen or two of this book.

At verse 157—

Woe! miserable mortals! Dare not thus
The utmost phials of God's fullest wrath!
Lay down the sword: forget the quarrel: leave
The murderous feud unfollowed. Learn to lave
Your bodies in the everlasting stream, and spread
Your supplicating hands to God's high throne,
Beseeching pardon, and with godly deeds
Healing the bitter spring of sin: then GOD
Shall send His mercy on you, nor destroy
According to your merits: He shall cause

His burning wrath to cease, if only all
 Shall exercise their souls with holy works.
 But if, O hard of heart, ye hear me not,
 But, for ye love transgression, turn away
 To crime and violence, a fire shall rage
 Throughout the world, and this shall be the sign :
 About the hour of sunrise, swords shall blaze,
 And trumpets echo, and the whole wide earth
 Shall hear the mighty uproar and dismay.
 Then the great globe's rotundity shall burn :
 And men and cities periah : and the fire
 Shall lick up streams and sea, and all be dust.
 But when destruction is fulfill'd, God's Hand
 Shall quench the fire it kindled; and the dust
 And ashes with a human form endue,
 And mortals re-create as first they were.
 Then shall the judgment be; then God shall sit
 Dooming the world Himself. Who sold themselves
 To foul transgression, shall again be piled
 With funeral heaps : but every pious soul
 Shall live again on earth, by God endued
 With spirit, breath, and vigour : they His grace
 Shall endlessly adore. O man, thrice bless'd !
 Who so shall see that day, and seeing, live !

These last lines, which conclude the book, are preserved in their fulness only in the Apostolic Constitutions (book 7). The concluding verses in the Sibylline MSS. were probably mutilated by some over-orthodox transcriber, for the purpose of bringing them into better agreement with the Apocalypse.

Next in age to the fourth book, comes that which is usually called the Proem. This was first edited in the *Princeps Editio* of Theophilus to Autolycus,—the same work which has been of late so ably translated by Mr. Flower,—in 1545, and at once created a sensation among the learned of Europe. From that time to this, it has stood as the preface to the whole collection of Oracles. Nothing is clearer than that this is the composition of a scholar in the Christian school of Alexandria: not only the general species of ratiocination is sufficient to prove the fact, but the reference made over and over again to the unfortunate cats whom the Egyptians turned into gods, is a proof in the same direction. Thus, in verse 60—

αἰσχυνθῆτε γὰρ αἱ καὶ κνώδαλα θειοποιούντες.

And again—

προσκυνῶντες ὄφεις, κύνας, αἰλούρους, ἀνόητοι,
 καὶ πετέευνα σίβεσθε, καὶ ἐρπετὰ θηρία γαίης.

It has been made a question, indeed, whether this Proem were not the work of an Alexandrian Jew, coeval with Ptolemy Philometor. But the references to the joys and glories of

paradise which constantly occur here and there; and again, and especially, the mention of the Bread of Heaven, 'the Bread of Angelic Hosts': 'the Sweet Bread of the starry heaven'—must be sufficient to settle the question; for what Alexandrian Jew ever thus spoke? And again, the phrase, *ζωὴν κληρονομοῦσι*, is not to be found in the Old Testament; and only twice is a similar expression to be met with, namely in Ecclesiasticus iv. 14, and xx. 25. Again, Paradise spoken of as eternal felicity occurs nowhere in the Old Testament, except in Ecclus. xlv. 16; and then not in the Greek, but only in the Latin version.

The so-called eighth book comes next. This is divided into four different portions by great lacunæ, and of these the two last are of a later date. The first is cited by Lactantius, but is manifestly later than the second. This second part begins with the celebrated acrostich, of which we will first give S. Augustine's version—that which is engraved at Ulm:—

Judicii signum, tellus sudore madescet.
 E cœlo Rex adveniet per sæcla futurus,
 Scilicet in carne præsens ut judicet orbem.
 Unde Deum cernent incredulus atque fidelis
 Celsum cum sanctis, ævi jam termino in ipso.
 Sic animæ cum carne aderunt, quas judicat ipse,
 Cum jacet incultus densis in vepribus orbis.
 Rejicient simulacra viri, cunctam quoque gazam:
 Exuret terras ignis, pontumque, polumque,
 Inquirens; tetri portas exuret Averni.
 Sanctorum sed enim cunctæ lux libera carni
 Tradetur; sontes æternum flamma cremabit.
 Occultos aëtos retegens tunc quisque loquetur;
 Secreta, atque Deus reserabit pectora luci.
 Tunc erit et luctus; stridebunt dentibus omnes.
 Eripitur solis jubar, et chorus interit astris;
 Volvetur cœlum; lunaris splendor obibit:
 Dejiciet colles, valles extollet ab imo:
 Non erit in rebus hominum sublime vel altum:
 Jam æquantur campis montes, et cœrula ponti
 Omnia cessabunt, tellus contraëta peribit:
 Sic pariter fontes torrentur fluminaque igni.
 Sed tuba tunc sonitum tristem dimittet ab alto
 Orbe, gemens facinus miserum variosque labores;
 Tartareumque chaos monstrabit terra dehiscens;
 Et coram hic Domino reges sistentur ad unum;
 Recidet e cœlis ignisque et sulphuris amnis.

The initials of S. Augustine's version run thus:—

Jesues Creistos Teu Dnios Soter.

The *c* in the first word is simply the effect of a desire to imitate the shape, as well as the sound, of the Greek sigma. The *e* in Creistos is the faithful copy of the original. The *Dn* in the

fourth word seems to have been intended to express the soft sound of the 'r. The other translations given by Alexandre are—that of an anonymous writer, quoted by Onuphrius Pannius, which simply gives the Greek letters: one by Onuphrius himself—Jesus Christus Dei Filius Servator Crux: one by Castalio—Jesus Chreistus Dei Filius Servator Crucis: by Aitzema—Jesus Christus Dei Filius, Servator. Cruc.: and by the Editor—Jesus Christus Dei Filius Salus in Cruce.

After so many attempts, it is surely our own duty to try this bow of Ulysses:—

J udgment at hand, the earth shall sweat with fear :
E ternal King, the Judge shall come on high :
S hall doom all flesh : shall bid the world appear
U nveiled before His Throne. Him every eye
S hall, just or unjust, see in majesty.

C onsummate time shall view the Saints assemble,
H is own assessors : and the souls of men
R ound the great judgment-seat shall wail and tremble
I n fear of sentence. And the green earth then
S hall turn to desert : they that see that day
T o moles and bats their gods shall cast away.

S ea, earth, and heaven, and hell's dread gates shall burn :
O bedient to their call, the dead return :
N or shall the Judge unfitting doom discern :

O f chains and darkness to each wicked soul :
F or them that have done good, the starry pole.

G nashing of teeth, and woe, and fierce despair
O f such as hear the righteous Judge declare
D eeds long forgot, which that last day shall bare.

T hen, when each darken'd breast He brings to sight,
H eaven's stars shall fall ; and day be changed to night ;
E ffaced the sun-ray, and the moon's pale light.

S urely the valleys He on high shall raise ;
A ll hills shall cease, all mountains turn to plain ;
V essel shall no more pass the watery ways :
I n the dread lightning parching earth shall blaze,
O gygian rivers seek to flow in vain :
U nutterable woe the trumpet blast,
R e-echoing through the ether, shall forecast.

T hen Tartarus shall wrap the world in gloom,
H igh chiefs and princes shall receive their doom,
E ternal fire and brimstone for their tomb.

C rown of the world, sweet wood, salvation's horn,
R earing its beauty, shall for man be born :
O wood, that Saints adore, and sinners scorn !
S o from twelve fountains shall its light be poured :
S taff of the Shepherd, and victorious sword.

With this acrostich may be well compared the remarkable epitaph, discovered at Autun, and first transcribed by Dom Pitra in 1839. We here give it, as restored partly by him, partly by Alexandre; with one reading, to be mentioned in its place, of our own. The acrostich is *ιχθὺς εἰς αἶε!*—

Ἰχθύος οὐρανίου θεῖον γένος ἦτορι σεμνῷ
 Χρῆσε λαλῶ[ν φωνή]ν ἄμβροτον ἐν βροτέοις·
 Θεσπεσίαν ὑδάτων τὴν σὴν, φίλε, θάλπεο ψυχὴν
 Ὑδασιν ἀενάοις πλουτοδότου σοφίης·
 Σωτήρος δ' ἀγίην μελιηδέα λάμβανε βρω[σιν]
 Ἔσθιε, πίνε, δ[ι]νεῖ[ν] ἰχθὺν ἔχων παλάμην·
 Ἰχθὺ Χ[ριστὲ] μέγα, Γαλιλαῖον δέσποτα Σῶτερ,
 Σὺν[γενέων ρ]υτὴρ, σὲ λιτάζομε, φῶς τὸ θανόντων
 Ἀ[λεξ]ανδρε πάτερ, τῷ μῶ κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ,
 Εὐμν[ήστω] σὺν μητρὶ καὶ αὐθαίμοις ἐμοῖσιν
 Ἰ[λαθι, καὶ παιδὸς] μνήσσο Πεκτορίου.

The *συγγενέων* seemed to us, when we saw the stone, next to certain. Alexandre's reading is *συσσίτων* which *may* be right: the acrostich forbids that which others read, *εὐσεβέων*.

The minute prophecies of our Lord's life, which occur in this book, are thus referred to by S. Justin (Cohort. § 38):—
πείσθητε τῇ ἀρχαιότητι καὶ σφόδρα παλαιᾷ Σιβύλλῃ, ἥς τὰς βίβλους ἐν πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ σώζεσθαι συμβαίνει, περὶ μὲν τῶν λεγομένων θεῶν ὡς μὴ ὄντων ἀπὸ τίνος δυνατῆς ἐπιπνοίας διὰ χρησμῶν ὑμᾶς διδασκούσῃ περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι παρουσίας καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γένεσθαι μελλόντων σαφῶς καὶ φανερώς προαναφαινούσῃ.

Next to this, in respect of antiquity, comes the first part of the eighth book. This describes very clearly the date of its own composition. After the reign of fifteen Roman emperors there shall be a king, says the Sibyl, with white hair: and the effigy of Hadrian is then drawn to the life. After this, *in the last days*, (and notice that expression,) there shall be three kings, whose names shall resemble that of Adonai—that is, the Antonines: and the misery of the human race during the period of their empire is most graphically described. After this we come to a mere guess-work of prophecy: how, when a fiery dragon shall come across the water, carrying a body of troops in its belly who shall fight against Rome,—then will be the end of the world, the signs of which are described again at length. It is next to certain, then, that this part of the book was written under Antoninus Pius; but not immediately after his accession: because he is here called old, whereas he was but fifty-four when he ascended the imperial throne. It is also almost certain that our poet had before his eyes that which we now call the fourth book, and that which is reckoned the second part of the

eighth, from which he appears to quote two lines. Of this also let us give a specimen:—

And after him, in Time's approaching end,
Three shall have rule, who bear GOD's highest name,
That name, whose might and glory lives for aye.
Of these, the first, now aged, yet shall hold
The sceptre for long years: a gloomy king,
Who shall shut up all wealth of every realm
Within his treasure-house, that when from far,
The matricide, returning, claims his own,
He may enrich his Asia with the spoil.

We shall have occasion shortly to unravel this prophecy: at present we may observe that after the eighth we may place the fifth book; the authorship of which is a question of great difficulty. It would appear, however, that, although some passages seem to be taken from the New Testament, the probability on the whole is, that the writer was a Jew; but whether Christian or Jew, he was undoubtedly an Egyptian, and therefore an Alexandrian. Alexandre makes him almost contemporary with the writer of the first part of the eighth book—perhaps a few years later. But to us the reference to the extinction of the fire of Vesta seems too clear to be passed over as an index to the real date. Now, according to Herodian, the destruction of the Temple of Vesta by fire took place in the year 191; and very soon after that this book would appear to have been composed.

Not to be tedious, next would follow the third part of the third book; then the sixth and seventh; then the first and second, which as poetical compositions, perhaps, claim the first place. Let us give a few specimens of them. The first book commences thus:—

Beginning from the earliest race of man
Until the latter day, my song shall tell
That which hath been, and is, and must be yet
In this world's history through human sin.
And, first, the God commands me that I say
How this world sprang to being. Thou, give ear
Lest thou forget that mightiest King of kings
Who said, "Let all things be," and all things were.
He set the earth on chaos, gave sweet light,
Arched high the heavens and smoothed the hoary sea,
And crowned the pole with stars, a tire of flame,
Adorned the earth with flowers, and fed the deep
With flowing rivers; through the air dispersed
Thick mists and dewy clouds. And next he formed
The fishy tribes of ocean; gave the birds
To soar amidst the air, and filled the woods
With beasts of divers races, and with them
That creep upon the ground; yea, all that is,
All that man views around him, owns his hand.

Then comes, in close accordance with the Book of Genesis, the history of the Fall; and partly from that and partly from the poetic tradition of the gold and silver ages, an account of the gradual deterioration of the human race. In his description of the Deluge, the pseudo-Sibyl has evidently in mind that most noble passage in Hesiod where Jupiter is represented as putting forth all his strength to crush the rebellious giants; and—which we do not remember to have seen noticed by any of the commentators on Milton—our own poet seems to have availed himself of the Sibylline description. Let us give the two passages. Thus Hesiod speaks (we quote from Elton's translation):—

— No longer then did Jove
Curb his full power : but instant in his soul
There grew dilated strength, and it was filled
With his omnipotence. At once he loosed
His whole of might, and put forth all the god.
The vaulted sky, the mount Olympian, flashed
With his continual presence; for he passed
Incessant forth, and scattered fires on fires.
Hurl'd from his hardy grasp the lightnings flew
Reiterated swift; the whirling flash
Cast sacred splendour, and the thunderbolt
Fell : roar'd around the nurture-yielding earth
In conflagration; for on every side
The immensity of forests crackling blazed :
Yea, the broad world burn'd red; the streams that mix
With ocean, and the deserts of the sea.

The Sibylline Oracles read thus :

Then pass'd his wife, his sons, then pass'd their wives
Into the wooden castle : after them
Those other tribes, whom GOD had willed to save.
But when the key had loosed its iron bolt,
And made all fast, the LORD's celestial will
Began its own accomplishment : He drove
Cloud over cloud, and hid the fiery disk :
And moon and stars, and heavenly coronet
He cover'd with His darkness : thunder'd loud,
O dread alarm to mortals ! forth He sent
The whirlwind of His wrath ; all winds that blew
He heap'd up one on other : at His word
The founts of the great deep were broken up :
The cataracts of heav'n descended, all
The abysses measureless of earth, unseal'd,
Pour'd forth their flood of waters : yea, the waves
Ten thousand times ten thousand, leapt and whirl'd
Over the boundless plains : and from the house
Of GOD Himself, with wind and waters black
The fierce loud billows dash'd adown the sky,
And all was wildest uproar ; while the ark
Cutting the boundless foam, securely rode
On the wild motion of the plangent waves.

The last line, in the original, may vie with that of Homer, in his epithet of the sea:—

στεῖρα, κινυμένων ἰδάτων κελαρυζομένων.

At its conclusion the poem—greatly to the surprise of its annotators—without any connecting link or other notice of the vast gap of time between the two events, proceeds to the coming of the Son of GOD. But most naturally: the Christian author, under the heathen impersonation, had been taught by S. Peter that the like figure, even baptism, does also now save us: was led from the ark to remember the Church; and by the Church was called at once to the Founder of that Church and His Incarnation. And thus he proceeds:—

But when the unmeasur'd billowy surge that seethed
Out of the huge abysses, now at length
Shall hear God's voice, and lessening, lessening still,
Sink back rebuked; and once again the heights
Of mountain peaks, and bold sea-breasting capes
Shall beetle as of old: then He, God's Son,
Son of the Living God, shall take man's flesh
Incarnate, and converse with Adam's race.
Now mark His name: four vowels shall it bear;
One consonant repeated: in its sound
Eight hundreds, decads eight, and monads eight.
Thus shalt thou know, and knowing shalt adore,
The eternal Father's co-eternal Son,
Anointed for His mission. He the law
Shall not destroy, but rather shall fulfil
In all its full significance of type,
And teach its holiest meaning. Priests shall come,
And bring their gold, their frankincense, their myrrh,
As seers have prophesied.

And running very briefly through our Blessed LORD's life, the Sibyl thus concludes the first book:—

But when He shall extend those glorious hands
And measure all things, and shall wear the crown
With thorns inwoven; when His glorious side
Is wounded with the spear, and night shall reign
For three hours' space amidst the height of day,
Then shall the Solomonian Temple show
A mighty sign, what time the King descends
To Hades, preaching freedom to the dead.
But when three days shall pass, then, death o'erthrown,
He shall ascend to light, and teach the way
That mortal steps must follow; and at length
He, rising glorious to His native heaven,
Shall point the road which leads His followers there.
Thenceforth the apostles shall be this world's guides,
And prophets' voice be silent evermore.

Or if Hexameters shall seem to give a better idea of the Sibylline works, take the following passage from the same book:—

This is the contest for man,—the prizes proposed for the soldier,
This is the Gate of Life, and sweet Immortality's portal :
God shall extend it to those that are greatest and truest of athletes,
In that they fought this fight,—and they that shall merit the guerdon,
Thus having won the reward, shall enter the Kingdom of Glory.

Then shall the end be at hand, when many a prophet of falsehood,
Filling the earth with his lies, shall deceive those ignorant thousands.
Belial also shall come, and performing deceivable wonders,
Draw away crowds to his worship. With mighty and dread devastation
Shall the elect be o'erwhelm'd—o'erwhelm'd both Gentiles and Hebrews.
Happy beyond compare, thrice happy and blessed the servant,
Whom, when He knocks, the LORD shall find awaiting His advent !
Noon it may be when He comes, or midnight ; cock-crow, or twilight :
But of a truth come He SHALL,—and prophecy then be accomplish'd.

We must not, however, pass without notice, the curious insertion, in the second book, of about a hundred verses from the moral poem of Phocylides. For an insertion it clearly is, and the way in which the coarsest and foulest lines of the original poem are either omitted or softened by the Christian compiler, is very curious ; and a complete proof that the poem in question was not for the first time composed by the writer of the Sibylline compositions.

Last of all, in age, come the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth books—first published by Cardinal Mai, at Rome, in 1828 ; except that the fourteenth had been already brought to light by Sluve, at Milan, in 1817.

We will now call attention to a few theological peculiarities of these books.

We have the most clear evidence of the orthodoxy of the Christian writers as to the Divinity of our Lord.

viii. 2. οὗτος ὁ νῦν προγραφεῖς ἐν ἀκροστιχίῳς Θεὸς ἡμῶν.

Again : viii. 462.

δέξαι ἐν ἀχράντοις Θεὸν σοῖς, Παρθένε, κόλπος.

And still more plainly at v. 474—

ἀλλ' οὐδὲν μέγα θαῦμα Θεῷ Πατρὶ καὶ Θεῷ Υἱῷ.

And so again, in the same book, v. 264 (it is a passage which Milton may have studied)—

ἀντὶν γὰρ πρῶτιστα λαβὼν σύμβουλون ἀπ' ἀρχῆς
εἶπεν ὁ Παντακράτωρ, ποιήσωμεν, τέκνον ἄμφω
εἰκόνας ἐξ ἰδύς ἀπομαζάμενοι βροτὰ φύλα·
νῦν μὲν Ἐγὼ χερσίν, σὺ δ' ἔπειτα λόγῳ θεραπεύσεις
μορφήν ἡμετέρεην.

Nor are the poems less explicit as to the Incarnation :—

xii. 32. καὶ τότε δὴ κρύφιος ἦξει Λόγος Ὑψίστοιο
σάρκα φέρων θνητοῖσιν ὁμοῖον. . . .

But here an exception must be made.

The sixth and seventh books, orthodox on our Lord's Divinity, are grossly—though we may fairly hope, unintentionally—heretical on His Incarnation; which they appear to connect, in some extraordinary way, with His Baptism;—a heresy which Irenæus attributes to some of the Cerinthians, and S. Epiphanius to the Ebionites. The passages are too long to quote, but may be found in vi. 3 and vii. 66.

The signs which our poets give of the end of the world are principally these:—

Mighty appearances in Heaven, iii. 334; v. 154; ii. 34.

Children with grey hairs at birth, ii. 154.

General barrenness of women, ii. 163.

The Fall of the Roman Empire, in numberless passages.

Antichrist.

The coming of Elijah.

The reign of a woman.

As to the grey hairs of children, it seems to have been simply a Gentile tradition.

Hesiod, *Opp. et Dies*, 178:—

Ζεὺς δ' ὀλέσει καὶ τοῦτο γένος μέροπων ἀνθρώπων
ἔντ' ἂν γινώμενοι πολιοκράται φει τελέθωσι.

With respect to the Fall of the Roman Empire, the Sibyl gives credit to a common prophecy, drawn from the numeral letters of *Ῥωμη*.

τρεῖς δὲ τριηκοσίους καὶ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ὀκτώ
πληρώσεις λυκάβαντας, ὅταν σοὶ δύσμορος ἦξη
μοῖρα βιαζομένη, τὸν οὖνομα πληρώσασα.

That is, that the 948th year of the city would be fatal to it.

But though the writer of this prophecy did not live to see that 948th year, the 2d of Severus—in which nothing happened—yet his continuer in the thirteenth book had actually outlived the time, and was forced to make another prophecy; something after the fashion of Dr. Cumming's errata in respect of the period of the Last Day. The second guess, however, was no more fortunate than the first. He devised the theory, that Rome had really been founded 105 years later than her *fasti* declared; and the fatal year, thus postponed again, fell in the 5th of Diocletian, by which time the bard—of the age of Aurelian—was doubtless sleeping well in the Catacombs, and very little concerned with the future of his augury.

Antichrist. The Sibylline idea seems to have been that this was Nero; an idea which long survived that monster's own life. One of those strange popular delusions, which also fixed on Sebastian of Portugal, and our own Edward V.—and, long

before, on Arthur—affirmed that Nero was not really dead; that he had escaped the vengeance of the Senate by flying into Parthia; that he would thence some day return, and again possessing himself of Rome, become the Antichrist of prophecy. The way in which the Sibyl interprets the prediction in the Revelation appears to be this (Rev. xvii. 8): ‘The beast that thou sawest, was and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition. . . . The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen’—Augustus, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, Nero—‘and one is’—Galba—‘and the other is not yet come’—Otho—‘and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And the beast that was and is not,’ namely Nero, ‘even he is the eighth’—that is to say, is rising again under the form of Vespasian, ‘and goeth into perdition. And the ten horns which thou sawest, are ten kings, which have received no kingdom ‘as yet,’—that is, Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, Nerva, Trajan, Adrian, Antoninus, Aurelius, Pertinax, Commodus.

But when it was manifest that the fifteenth Roman emperor had departed this life, and still no appearance of Antichrist, while the length of time that had elapsed since the reign of Nero rendered the expectation of his return impossible, another belief began to possess the Church. It now began to be said that Antichrist, though he might have found a type in Nero, would be a Jew; by his father of the tribe of Dan, by his mother a Samaritan. There are various reasons to be drawn from Scripture for the selection of that tribe. In the first place, its omission in the list of those that each afforded their twelve thousand in the Revelation. Next, that in the prophetic declaration, after the mention of Dan, the patriarch exclaims, ‘I have waited for thy salvation, O LORD;’ as if there were another salvation, and another LORD in some way connected with that tribe. And this belief lasted down into the Middle Ages; inso-much that in such writers as S. Hrabanus Mawrus, Abælard, Rupert, and the like, the current opinion seems to be that when a pope of the tribe of Dan shall ascend the chair of S. Peter, it is he that will be Antichrist. And in the writings of the later Sibylline bards, Belial, or Beliar, is the name by which Antichrist is called.

The next sign of the end of the world is the coming of Elijah. This is distinctly referred to in book ii. line 187. The poet writes thus:—

And then the Tishbite in a fiery car
Descending from the heavens, shall show these signs
That herald the approach of this world’s end.
Woe, woe, for them that then shall bear the load

Of near maternity! Woe, woe, for them
That to their helpless babes give suck! For them
That dwell beside the sea! Woe, woe, for all
That shall behold that day, if day it be,
When o'er the boundless earth a pitchy cloud
From east to west, from north to south shall roll.
Then shall this stream of blazing flame go forth
Before the heavenly throne, and laying waste
Both earth and ocean, every creek and bay,
Each lake and stream, each fountain, and the depths
That lie beneath the earth, shall glitter, high
Even to the heavenly poles.

What the three miracles are that Elijah, in his character as one of the two witnesses, is to perform, does not seem so certain. Probably the Sibyl, applying Rev. xi. 5, 6, to that prophet alone, reckoned them thus:—1. 'If any man will hurt 'em, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their 'enemies.' 2. 'These have power to shut heaven, that it rain 'not, in the days of their prophecy.' 3. 'And have power 'over waters to turn them to blood.'

Of the heterodox teaching of the Sibylline books, that which has excited the greatest attention is the denial—occurring, however, only in one place, ii. 300—of the eternity of future punishment:—

τοῖς καὶ ὁ παντοκράτωρ Θεὸς ἀφθίτος ἄλλο παρέξει
εὐσεβείην, ὑπόταν Θεὸν ἀφθίτον αἰτήσωνται
ἐκ μαλτροῦ πυρὸς μακραίωνων τ' ἀπὸ βροντῶν
ἀνθρώπους σῶσαι δώσει· καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσει
λεξιμένοι γὰρ ἕκαστον ἀπὸ φλογὸς ἐκαμάτοιο
ἄλλος' ἀποστήσας πέμψει διὰ λαὸν ἑαυτοῦ
εἰς ζωὴν ἑτέραν καὶ αἰώνιον ἀθανάτοισιν
'Ηλυσιφ πεδίῳ.

This is the very doctrine of Origen, but emphatically denounced by the copyist of one of the best Sibylline MSS. in certain tuneless lines, which savour of the seventh or eighth century:—

ψευδὴ προφανῶς· οὐδὲ γὰρ λήξα ποτὶ
τὸ πῦρ καλᾶζον τοὺς κατακεκριμένους
καὶ γὰρ ἂν εὐξαιμι τοῦθ' οὐτῶς ἔχειν
οὐλαῖς μεγίσταις σφαλμάτων ἔστε γνέμενος.
αἱ μείζονος χρήζουσι φιλανθρωπίας
ἀλλ' αἰσχυρέσθω φληναφῶν Ὀριγένης,
πέρας γενέσθαι τῶν κολασίων λέγων.

The teaching with respect to angels is very full and well developed. We read, in the seventh book, of a kind of angelic guardianship, though perhaps not precisely that which the later Church has held:—

οἱ δὲ διαγγελτῆρες ὑπαὶ ποσὶ κοιμήσονται,
οἱ τε πυρὸς φαίνουσι, καὶ οἱ ποταμοὺς φαίνουσιν,
οἱ τ' ἄστη σώζουσι, καὶ οἱ πέμπουσιν ἄγτας.

The names of some of the angels are clearly taken from the apocryphal books, and more especially from that of Enoch:—

ἡζουσ' Ἰρεμήλ, Ὀριήλ, Σανήλ, Ἀζαήλ

—or, Ἀζαζήλ—Oriel is, of course, Uriel; but Azazel in the book of Enoch (chap. xlii. and lxviii.) is a demon. Hence our great poet, whose learning really seems unfathomable:—

‘that proud honour claim’d

Azazel as his right, a cherub tall.’

It had been our intention to add somewhat on the—we can only call them so—*vagaries* of the Sibylline metre. But we fear that the subject is not, to the greater part of our readers, of sufficient interest to warrant such a disquisition. We will, therefore, end by simply recommending the study of these curious books to those who would learn the politico-religious views of the third and fourth centuries; to those who are interested in prophetic interpretations of the Apocalypse; and to those who would see the gradual shading off of Alexandrine Judaism into Alexandrine Christianity: the two so clearly presenting a certain community of features; and yet so marvelously, so irreconcilably at variance.

And we are bound once more to express the great obligations which ecclesiastical scholars have incurred to M. Alexandre, for this most laborious, most accurate, most admirable edition of one of the hardest—most corrupt—most obscure—of all works. Surely he will apply his learning and talent to the elucidation of some other monument of antiquity, if not more intrinsically valuable, at least probably more universally interesting.

ART. III.—1. *History of the Life and Times of Edmund Burke.*

By THOMAS MACKNIGHT. Vol. III. London: Chapman and Hall. 1860.

2. *Recollections and Private Memoirs of Washington.* By his adopted son, GEORGE WASHINGTON PARKE CUSTIS. New York: Derby and Jackson. 1860.

WE join these two volumes under one notice, rather for the contrast, than for the resemblance between them; because, that is, the two heroes of them were so very unlike, though each a thorough representative of the Anglo-Saxon race, and their fortunes so very unequal, though the genius of each was, in its kind, equally pre-eminent. Because, further, the one book, being a fair sample of the school of biography, which assumes it to be merely a special portion of history, is well written, and yet tells us so little; the other (the American), a specimen of the more personal and anecdotal kind, is faulty in style, and yet tells us so much.

Mr. Macknight's third and concluding volume embraces the period of Burke's life marked by his efforts against Warren Hastings, and the progress of the French Revolution. Our generation, which has forgotten his labours for purging Parliament of its place- and pension-mongering scandals, and has received from the somewhat ungrateful Whig party but very slender intimations of his less public task of cementing that party, under the auspices of Lord Rockingham, and of teaching it what its principles really were and must grow into, still is attracted by, and inquires into his part and standing-point in those mighty events.

The great achievement of Burke's career is popularly considered to be the prosecution of Warren Hastings; he himself seems to have so esteemed it. It was, indeed, the darling of his old age, when he was now losing authority, and sometimes even respect, in the House of Commons. It was the last great occasion on which, when now disowned almost by his old disciples of the Whig party, he once more stood forward as their acknowledged leader. In the features of the case there was something grandly poetical and, also, apparently practical. It was to be shown by the trial, that a nation could kindle with the sentiment of compassion and the love of justice, like an individual; and that each particular act of iniquity perpetrated under the auspices of uncontrolled power, thousands of miles

away, could be brought under the cognizance and condemnation of the British Legislature. That there was something theatrical and unreal in the display was not Burke's fault, but incident to the very essence of the matter; and the same may be said for the unexampled prolixity of the proceedings, and the final vagueness of the result. The trial itself seems scarcely to have been projected by Burke. We are told that he did not believe it possible to convict Hastings, or that it would ever have come to an impeachment. He only wanted to have his charges supported by a respectable minority in the Commons, and this seemed to him a sufficient justification. And so it seems to us; and, also, that 'all the conjectures about his wishing to 'avenge on Hastings the downfall of the Coalition Ministry, 'and thus retrieve the fortunes of the field, are not supported 'by facts.'

Yet, in the conduct of the case, his demeanour appears to us open to the gravest censure. We do not think, with Mr. Mac-knight, that when the Opposition endeavoured to force into the number of its managers, Francis, the late Governor's deadly enemy, it was a *weak* reply of Pitt to Windham, that "however 'gentlemen might reason, there was a feeling against appointing 'a man who had certainly been an enemy of Hastings, and had 'met him in mortal conflict, one of his public prosecutors;' on the contrary, Burke's persistency in demanding such a selection was grossly indecent; and the argument, that the Commons were not judges, but simply prosecutors, merely sophistical, it being altogether opposed to the practice and spirit, if not to the letter of ordinary law, to have for an advocate against the accused his own personal foe. Exception should, on yet deeper principles of justice, be taken to the statesman's conduct during the progress, and on the conclusion of the prosecution. What possible right could a prosecutor have to retort even an insult to himself, by branding the accused as 'that wicked wretch, that scourge of India, that criminal;' or, still further, to struggle against the design of reimbursing the acquitted statesman the cost of his defence. It appears to us the most apparent equity, that when a public servant had been absolved, after many years of the most agonizing anxiety, and after having been for all that time proposed as a mark for the wit and declamation of the greatest, and, if we think of Sheridan, we may say, not always the most conscientious of orators, and declared to be innocent of every wickedness laid to his charge, the nation in whose cause he had incurred the odium—which the same people, by its highest court of judicature, had pronounced to be baseless,—should at least make the small atonement in its power, by paying debts which, but for services performed on its behalf, he would never have

accumulated. It may be said (Burke, indeed, was always assuming it) that, though acquitted, he was guilty. We think this not at all improbable; but how is such an allegation to the point? It is not allowed in the interest of ordinary plaintiffs in civil disputes, it is equally unnatural in criminal causes, first to confirm and recognise the authority of judges, by bringing the matter before them, and as soon as a sentence contrary to one's wishes has been uttered, to disclaim it. Either no verdict against Hastings could have been fairly carried into execution, or a verdict for him should have been allowed by the prosecutors to have been effectual. The theory of a trial is, that the accusers—in this case, the managers for the House of Commons—believe a crime to have been committed, and by a particular person, but that by carrying the thing before a court, they make it an umpire between them and the accused. When the sentence of acquittal was given by this court, it was entirely illogical in Burke to argue that the Minister's report to the House of Commons—to carry into effect, as it were, the sentence, by putting the late Governor into the same position pecuniarily as he was in before the proceedings commenced—was 'a kind of 'censure upon the managers of the impeachment, and a practical 'contradiction' to the vote that an impeachment should be conducted; that is, a vote, not that Hastings was guilty, but that there was sufficient appearance of guilt to warrant a solemn judicial inquiry into it. This is a point to which, we believe, not enough attention has been generally directed. We concur with the common conclusion of our times, and, indeed, of contemporaries, that great offences had been perpetrated against that British theory of the morality of government, which no Englishman has a right to disavow on the shallow principle that the corresponding duties of subjects are not recognised in the East; and we certainly shall not worry our readers with repetitions of this *crambe repetita* any more than with prolix disquisitions on the authorship of Junius. But the question of the propriety of Burke's obstinate resistance to the graceful act of parliamentary benevolence, in pensioning the victim of the inherent lengthiness of a prosecution for the misgovernment of a great empire, is one of a very different nature.

Mankind have become pardonably weary of hearing of this trial, which had no direct result, and the use of which in history seems rather too like that of an exhibition of wax-works, to introduce, that is, a fine pageant of great names and sounding titles, not to illustrate the character of their bearers, or of their times. The one point of interest in it is any light which may possibly be thrown from it upon the character of the great orator whose energy in reality created it. His fervid imagina-

tion, we doubt not, was influenced by the splendid spectacle, equally with the spectators who made part of it, and those who now read of it in Macaulay's noble essay; but it was assuredly not for the sake of a grand occasion for display that he took the front rank in the solemnity. The ardour of his fancy must not be confounded with vanity; it maddened him when he probed into the intricacies of statesmanship in an Asiatic dependency; so that, Mr. Macknight confesses, his temper grew worse with the anxiety of the impeachment, and he showed himself, 'on many occasions, more violent and intemperate than any of his political associates.' The details of despotism were so vividly present to his mind, that he could not understand how, except from guilty obstinacy, they did not work the same effect of wrath against the offender in the hearts of all his contemporaries. But this was no new feature in his character, or even his conduct. As his biographer observes of the harshness of the 'Letter to a noble Lord,' so now, 'it was the grief itself which produced the bitterness,'—the grief of seeing himself virtually abandoned by his old associates, and admired only for the philosophic faculty of theorizing which men of theory themselves so very commonly are the most inclined to despise. But it was only in degree that any change in his demeanour can be allowed to have taken place at this time. Robert Hall was right in declaring that those who had studied carefully Burke's earlier works, had little reason for astonishment at his subsequent conduct. He was at all times a Cassandra, preaching without result; and the true causes of this phenomenon in his fortunes may be traced in his disposition. He himself was ever fond of saying, that he 'hated the very sound of an abstract principle;' that he 'was no enthusiast, but a sober, reflecting man;' and of holding himself out, so far as accordant with morality, as a professor of expediency. Yet this was the man who harangued powerfully against the war with America, for the condemnation of Warren Hastings, for a war with the French Revolutionists, and whose plans and arguments on all three occasions proved, in appearance, conspicuously without issue. The truth is, that he had a great genius for the philosophy of statesmanship, and great insight into human character, but very little power of sifting the relation between the nature of particular individuals and of the circumstances in which they were to act. It was with him, as it might be with a chemist in a dyeing factory: the man of science could well expound the general effects of a special application, but not apply the rule to an individual object as skilfully as the workman to whom practice has given a new instinct of sight and touch. The fact that his pleadings produced so little effect

must have been apparent enough to the orator ; but he always refused to refer this to any defect in his own tactics.

Mr. Macknight appears to concur thoroughly in Burke's own estimate of his practical skill. Because he forced the House of Commons to vote the impeachment of the late Governor-General of India, he thinks he was completely successful, though the trial ended in the acquittal of the accused. On the same principle, Lord George Gordon might claim to be released from the limbo of lunatic enthusiasts, in which he is still confined by the verdict of posterity, on the ground that he succeeded in raising an agitation, though he could not make it fruitful of any effect. The phenomenon, however, of a man of great genius coveting and asserting the possession of practical ability when he has it not, is by no means so uncommon as to afford reasonable room for the mistake so often made by their admirers in assenting to their pretensions. Burke clearly saw the faults of a system : the fault of the Tories in continuing an useless conflict with the colonies ; the fault of the Radicals of the era of the French Revolution in their wild doctrine of universal equality. His vision was so clear, that he felt himself an inspired opponent of these errors of parties ; but it naturally escaped his observation, that, as his adversaries had gone wrong by consulting their prejudices, so he had detected their aberrations by the aid of counter-prejudices in himself, and which, suffered to stray uncontrolled, would have led a statesman, with real power in his hands, into equally dangerous extremes. It would be paradoxical to deny him the possession of judgment altogether, for an acute critical power, in relation both to men and measures, is one of his most distinguishing characteristics ; but what he failed in, was the habit, and perhaps the faculty, of applying this critical sagacity to himself. He might preside at the council of war, and give the watchword ; but a much cooler head, a man who could see the strong as well as the weak points in an enemy's defences, was needed to command in action. Inconsistency, it is true, cannot fairly be imputed to him ; at least, not that inconsistency which can in any way diminish men's opinion of a statesman's good faith. As we look back from this vantage-ground of almost a century onward, we perceive that Burke was right in opposing Grenville's administration on their American policy, not so entirely without a defence for aiding in the formation of the Coalition Ministry, right in his attacks on the exercise of royal prerogative by which that cabinet was shattered, and right again in attacking the assaults upon royal prerogative in France and in England by advanced Radicals. But is this circumstance, viz., that inconsistency cannot be brought home to a man, by itself evidence of great statesmanlike powers ? If statesmanship

consists in governing men, it certainly is not. Besides many other qualities, it is not sufficient merely to support the opinion on the face of it seemingly opposed to old tenets; but the statesman must not, while maintaining new dogmas, seem to have abandoned the old. Burke was in the right at both periods of his parliamentary career; but he stood somewhat in the position of a renegade in the eyes of his contemporaries, because, in the triumph of liberalism abroad, he threw himself, with his whole weight, into the opposite scale, as though the iniquities of a party in one country could ever justify the desertion of the analogous party in another. Burke argued as though Liberals were, if not to abnegate, at all events to preserve complete silence about their principles in England, because those principles abroad had been perverted. It was this that alienated from him and enraged his old companions, not altogether without reason; and it was a character which led him at different periods of his life into conduct of this sort, which has, without detracting from his greatness in the eyes of posterity as a philosophical statesman, justified, at the same time, the demeanour of men like Fox towards him.

Persons who assert that he was guided by corrupt motives in acting as he did, by offended vanity, if not by the grosser incentives of self-interest, are not worth reasoning with. In no sense of the term can he be called a selfish man; but yet he was the prey of an absorbing, however noble, egotism: a feeling that his own sentiments were the true standard by which all true patriots should gauge theirs. This is a common accompaniment of that literary type which is observed to predominate, not merely in professional men of letters, but even in some lawyers and statesmen. It is a tone of thought which redeems their words and writings from the risk of superannuation; but it is, in almost every case, indicative of some want of capacity for adaptation to the exigencies of the time. It was this egotism which 'broke into fragments,' as Lord John Russell confesses, in his 'Life of Fox,' 'the great and firm body of the English Whigs.' It was this same quality, or rather colour of disposition and temperament, which, as before the French Revolution it had caused him to be, as Mr. Macknight says was the case, 'not on the best of terms with his party, particularly Sheridan and Fox, his advice 'being scarcely ever asked, and never attended to,' so, after that event, made him into a sort of political hermit. It was, at all events, the kind of character than which none could be more unsuitable to a political leader.

It may indeed be objected that a man can be scarcely reckoned among unpractical men, who always effected that which he attempted; who harangued against the American War, and

helped to crush the Cabinet which supported it; who led the onslaught upon pensions and places, and curtailed that form of bribery; who took up the cause of India in a scornful, neglectful House of Commons, and made them take up that cause as their own; who, lastly, when repudiated by his old friends, could teach them that, 'if his support was of no account, his hostility was to be dreaded, for that he held their political fortunes in his possession, and was to strike a blow from which the party would not recover for more than a generation.' But success is not always a proof of practical abilities. These are shown, not so much by the energy of an onslaught upon hostile views, as by the use made of opportunities, and the power, in new circumstances, of maintaining the same relation to old friends. Burke was right in his dislike of the excesses of the French reformers, but wrong in that he manifested his aversion, not by carrying his party along with him in condemning, as a party, these excesses, but by passing over in spirit, as well as in fact, and 'squeezing himself in between Pitt and Dundas,' at the head of the English Conservatives. When he did this, he did in effect retire from active political life, as the Whig newspaper organs, in their insolent way, gave out. Henceforth he only did in Parliament what he might have accomplished as well out, viz. deliver eloquent and often profound essays. The very fact, mentioned by his latest biographer, as though to demonstrate his influence as a practical statesman, that 'no great debate passes now without Burke being appealed to as the most unexceptionable authority by one side or the other, and generally by both sides,' proves too much, indicating his true position as being, perhaps, above both parties, but certainly not at the head of either.

That his contemporaries should not have clearly recognised his isolated grandeur, while acutely detecting his impracticability as a leader, was to be expected. Mr. Macknight accounts it a gross crime. Literary men are rather too fond of assuming that it is the bounden duty of all of practical abilities to bow down to those who can accomplish results only in the future. Fox was but little of a philosopher, and perhaps still less of a literary man. Pitt has left no works behind him but the great one of the national debt; and, consequently, when the latter came into collision with Burke on the matter of Sir Elijah Impey, we are told that such conduct was 'unbecoming in one who was so much the inferior in years, in attainments, and in genius,' while Fox's opposition to a tone which seemed to compromise English liberalism is denounced as obviously inconsistent with his former generous assertion that he had learnt more from Burke than from all the books he ever read; and he is

held up to reprobation as clearly the aggressor in an indefensible quarrel. We do not see this. Some great men's greatness produces its fruits at once, and that of others ripens more slowly. Let both have their proportionate praise and rank. It is unfair for those who are to reap innumerable harvests of fame and sympathy in futurity, to require homage from the men who can give their age but one impulse, and then are gone.

While Lord Rockingham lived, the defects of Burke's political character were not very apparent. He was able—no one better—to spy out a weakness in the adversary's arguments, and point an attack; and his deference for his great and docile patron made him submit readily to the directions furnished by that nobleman's characteristic caution as to the proper time and objects for the onslaught. He never learned that for one object he should not sacrifice all others; but, during that earlier period, he acquiesced in such views when taken by his colleagues. Subsequently, when emancipated from patrons, and independent, he acted as though everything ought to be neglected and thrown aside till the one topic of his mind was thoroughly exhausted. Considerateness for the accused, during the prosecution of Hastings, he regarded as sympathy with his imputed crimes; and, with his imagination and passions kindled almost into frenzy by the reflection in his mind of the extravagances of the French Revolution, he wrote and spoke in a way to justify the charge of Francis, that 'it was 'easy to pity the sufferings of individuals, but no tears were 'shed for nations;' or Fox's retort upon him of an expression used by himself in the interest of our revolted colonies, 'I 'do not know how to draw up a bill of indictment against a 'whole people.' We must repeat, that his error as a politician lay, not in the fact that he ever consciously, if sometimes unconsciously, said what was false, or disguised the truth; but that he did not care to temper one conviction of his mind with another, but now threw his whole weight into the one scale, now into the other. We who have before us his whole career as a statesman, can see that he was never, or very rarely, in sentiment inconsistent, for that one impulse of aversion for tyranny balanced another impulse of loathing for a raw fervour of innovation. His contemporaries may be pardoned for not laboriously weighing against a furious burst of invective against the one an equally violent assault upon the other.

It is a rather ungrateful task to attempt to discover in so grand a statesman's own temperament a reason for his own personal insignificance in the midst of the triumph of his tenets and schemes. It is ungrateful, not merely because it appears to imply a depreciation of this wonderful genius, but

still more as liable to be regarded as a defence of the parties which, at the same time, profited by and maltreated him. We have endeavoured to show why it was that his companions dared to spurn and ridicule his counsels; but the explanation of the cause is no apology for the fact. Those hootings and obstinate determination to hear nothing opposed to their own favourite dogmas, are a disgrace upon not only the Whig interest, but the House of Commons as a deliberative assembly.

The same intemperateness which made him, while so farsighted in perceiving objects at any distance in a straight line, utterly incapable of reconnoitring the circumjacent circumstances, followed him into private life. The death of an only son almost deprived him of reason; and the love of splendour and good taste made him, for rearing a mansion with 'beautiful wings and stately colonnades,' accumulate debts the discharging of which tasked and occupied the residue of his widow's days, and forced the overthrower of pension-lists to receive thankfully part of the royal or national bounty. It need scarcely be said that we see no crime in Burke's accepting of this favour at the hands of the ministers; yet it is unpleasant to find that this unselfish patriot put himself by uncalled-for extravagance into an apparently equivocal position: and we must protest against Mr. Macknight's argument, that they have no right to accuse Burke of prodigality who can see nothing in Hastings' pecuniary transactions to blame. The expenses of Hastings' trial were forced upon him; but surely the free hospitality and magnificence of Beaconsfield were voluntary luxuries on the part of his great accuser.

Yet Burke, such as he was, will always be reckoned, whether from the potentiality of his genius or the actual effects produced by him, among the really great men of Europe. He in England, and Washington in America, have set their mark ineffaceably upon the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, the results which were mainly due to their exertions in neither case seem to have been in exact accordance with the general tenour of their author's temperament. Burke was surely an ardent lover of his country's greatness; but it was his eloquent voice which, by pleading against the advocates for the justice of the colonial war, damped the national enthusiasm, gave the sympathies of half the land to the insurgents, and so made eventual success hopeless; for who can suppose that, however just the revolutionary cause, had Great Britain determined to conquer, it could not have done so? He was equally a friend of liberty; yet his passionate denunciations revived Toryism, and were appealed to, most undeservedly it is true, as authorities for tyranny by all the despots of Europe. Washington, on the contrary, was by birth and con-

nexions, by antecedents, and, still more, by disposition, a Conservative, a born friend of aristocracy, and hater of democracy. Further, he disliked theory, and seemed to understand only the practical bearing of measures. Yet to him almost exclusively the United States are indebted for the triumph of their Revolution, and the favourers of revolution for a proof of the practicability of schemes, however apparently desperate. But with the analogy of the contrast in both between their tone of feeling and the policy, of effectuating which they were the chief instruments, the resemblance between them stops. The Englishman—for it is impossible to think of Burke as an Irishman—was never the agent in carrying out the plans which he made triumph. He persuaded practical men of their practicability; and his pupils, now a Fox and now a Pitt, brought them into operation. He ever held himself out as a man of action; but his activity seldom ever extended beyond words. He controlled opinion, but not votes. The American leader propounded no theories; but he gave to ideas form and substance. Men learnt what were his thoughts only from his deeds. Other men's words explain their life; his life was its own interpreter. About a man of this type every contemporary record and reminiscence possesses an inestimable value. We are interested in minute particulars respecting Burke. It is pleasant to hear of his efforts at farming, of his reproof of the condemnation of indiscriminate charity, because its broken-down object might spend the alms in gin—'if gin will give him comfort, let him have gin;' but it is only, after all, the objectless curiosity, which dwells eagerly on every detail about those we admire, and whom we already have thoroughly scanned, which is gratified. It is like the pleasure at dwelling on every feature of a scene we can see any day we please, as compared with the very different sentiment of a man planning emigration, looking at a photograph of an Australian prairie. In Burke's works we have all the essential materials for a complete insight into his character. Every detail of his private domestic life and habits is only useful as corroborating a foregone conclusion. If those furnished in a biography were opposed to the clear inferences derived from his works, the reader would be inclined rather to put the stories on one side as untrue, or as capable, were the circumstances fully narrated, of bearing a different construction, than to abandon in their favour the conclusion already come to. But Washington's character is to be translated, as it were, entirely out of the cipher of his actions; and as no interpretation of hieroglyphics can be accepted which is completely irreconcilable with one inscription in the same character, every portion of his life requires to be held up to the closest scrutiny.

One of the most striking characteristics of this great man is his entire absence of resemblance to the majority of his countrymen. These *Recollections* of him by his adopted son, while suggesting most vividly his character, themselves contain most terrible evidence of the tawdry love of the stilted and mock-poetic which has so long been the besetting sin of American literature. Why should all American authors, with but two or three undoubted exceptions, harangue on the topics of everyday life in the style of Choctaws in their war paint? As the beautiful Melusine, in the fairy tale, had to atone for her unnatural exchange of her original form for feminine loveliness, by re-assuming, on periodical occasions, her hereditary snakehood, is the national genius of the New World doomed to expiate its precocious practical-mindedness, its propensity for wooden nutmegs, and such pleasant exuberances of a trafficking enthusiasm, by reverting in its literature to the petty pomposities of the aborigines of its backwoods? Two exceptions there certainly are to this rule of majestic trifling—Irrving and Longfellow. We might have supposed that the precociousness of the national hero in the first case, and the circumstance of having inhabited the general's quarters at Cambridge in the second, had protected them from the pervading infection, but for the in-auspicious appearance of the plague-marks thick on the effusions of Washington's own child by adoption and education.

The reader of this otherwise interesting volume is again and again nauseated by romantic garnishings of a really heroic career. We cannot get through twenty pages without being informed of some apocryphal Indian chief's declaration, that 'the Great Spirit protected that man, that he might become the chief of nations,' or being told that he was 'Pater Patriæ,' and also 'first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.' The following episode in the boyhood of Washington may be quoted, both as instancing his firm courage from the first, and as a fair sample of the diction of the book:—'One colt there was, a sorrel, destined to be as famous (?), and for much better reason, as the horse which the brutal emperor raised to the dignity of consul. This sorrel was of fierce, ungovernable nature, and resisted all attempts to subject him to the rein. He had reached his fullest size and vigour unconscious of a rider; he ranged free in the air which he snuffed in triumph, tossing his mane to the winds, and spurning the earth in the pride of his freedom. It was a matter of common remark that a man never would be found hardy enough to back and ride this vicious horse. Several had essayed, but, deterred by the fury of the animal, they had desisted from their attempts, and the steed remained unbroken. The young Washington pro-

'posed to his companions, that if they would assist him in
 'confining the steed, so that a bridle could be placed in his
 'mouth, he would engage to ride this terror of the parish.
 'Accordingly, early the ensuing morning, the associates decoyed
 'the horse into an inclosure, where they secured him, and
 'forced a bit into his mouth. Bold, vigorous, and young, the
 'daring rider sprang to his unenvied seat, and bidding his
 'comrades remove their tackle, the indignant courser rushed to
 'the plain. As if disdaining his burden, he at first attempted
 'to fly; but soon felt the power of an arm which could have
 'turned his Arab grandsires in their wildest courses on their
 'native deserts. The struggle now became terrific to the be-
 'holders. But the youthful hero, that "Spirit-protected man,"
 'clung to the furious steed, till, centaur-like, he appeared to
 'make part of the animal itself. Long was the conflict; and the
 'fears of the associates became more relieved as, with matchless
 'skill, the rider preserved his seat, and with unyielding force
 'controlled the courser's rage, when the gallant horse, summon-
 'ing all his powers to one mighty effort, reared and plunged
 'with tremendous violence, burst his noble heart, and died in an
 'instant.' We further learn, in various places, that Wash-
 'ington's mother, 'the Mother of Romans,' 'who first bent the
 'twig to incline the tree to glory,' 'was made of sterner stuff'
 'than to be moved by all the pride that glory ever gave, and
 'all the pomp and circumstance of power;' that 'the modern
 'Cincinnatus' 'gave to liberty's drooping eagles a renewed and
 'bolder flight, when a mercenary foe aimed against him the
 'fatal blow;' that, 'on seeing his commander standing amidst
 'a roar of musketry, alive, unharmed, and without a wound,
 'his aid, a gallant and warm-hearted son of Erin, a man
 'of thews and sinews, and albeit unused to the melting mood,
 'wept like a child for joy;' that when he went to bed, he was
 'visited, not by plain sleep, but by 'tired nature's sweet restorer,
 'balmy sleep;' that 'his physiognomy did not in its type express
 'the reckless ambition of the broad-fronted Cæsar, or the
 'luxurious indulgence of the curled Anthony, but rather the
 'better age of Rome, the Fabius Maximus, Marcellus, or the
 'Scipios; that, in short, he had a form upon which every god
 'did seem to set his seal, to give the world assurance of a man;'
 'that when he was a few minutes behind his time, 'twas strange,
 'twas passing strange;' and that the Father of his Country's
 epoch was 'the awful period that tried men's souls.' But it is
 useless attempting to give the reader a conception of the inflation
 of style in this volume; for in every page—nay, almost in every
 line—we see, as it were, the writer's intellect and fancy poised
 upon tiptoe, trying, it may be imagined, to look over into a

vessel of certainly very disproportionate dimensions to his adopted son's genius. The ludicrousness of this vast expenditure of rhetoric is made the more manifest by the conspicuous reserve and simplicity of character in the subject of its 'Recollections,' which it is their great merit to have especially brought to light and displayed. In a life of Patrick Henry, of Jefferson, or of Webster, we have no right to be startled at finding the *Æneid* or *Pharsalia* done into English blank verse, with the divisions of the lines not marked, and the title of Biography prefixed; but *à priori* one might have hoped to have had memorials of Washington at least treated as sacred ground, not to be desecrated by plaster monuments to the eloquence of their preserver or compiler.

It is pleasant to find that, in this nation of talkers, Washington was distinguished, even in his youth, when he sat in the Pre-revolutionary House of Burgesses, as a silent rather than a speaking member. But even much more minute particulars have a significance as respects this great character. The regularity of his taste, even at a luxurious Virginian breakfast-table, when he always chose simply Indian cakes, honey, and tea; the veracity in all his dealings, which made the brand 'George Washington' exempt a barrel of flour from the customary inspection in the West India ports; the invariable toast, 'All our friends,' after dinner; his honest exactness in doing a day's work in the day, his love of domestic social conversation, his cheerful piety, the Sunday readings of old-fashioned standard English divines, the frequent walk to his watchmaker when in Philadelphia to regulate his watch, the moving of the lips and raising of the hand, marking meditations very different from the scene around him; even the kindly grasp of a coachmaker's hand by the President of a great nation, and the ever-thoughtful care for his old servants and soldiers; the otherwise most trifling details, of which this volume has certainly its full share, all borrow dignity from their subject, and are as interesting as the greatest events in the lives of ordinary statesmen.

The 'Recollections' embrace all the four divisions of Washington's life—his career previous to the War of Independence, the war itself, his demeanour as President, and finally, his happy retirement till his death, full of years, honours, and love, at Mount Vernon. Many most interesting particulars—interesting spite of the air of burlesque spread over them by the author's ambitious ultra-Homeric style—are narrated about the earliest of these times; but Sparkes and Washington Irving have already culled most of the flowers. In the second period we discover everywhere suggestions for a confutation of the popular de-

preciation of Washington's generalship. It has been the habit to represent him as accomplishing everything, as it were, by the perfection of his moral character, or through the miserable mismanagement of the British. It is very true that, without assistance from the latter cause, the germ of a nation like the American colonies could not have wrenched themselves free from a great empire such as ours; but it was not at all so sufficiently greater in extent than the gross incapacity of many of the colonial commander's dictators in Congress, and his co-adjutors elsewhere, as to explain the final result without the recognition, as essential in accomplishing this, of the genius of Washington himself. Lord Stanhope, in the narrative of these events contained in his most judicious history, appears to find, in the conduct at home of Lord North and Lord George Germaine and their fellow-ministers, a full reason for the issue. He praises Washington's noble nature—as who must not?—but he never sees the great general. Yet, if not mere success (a test which would surely insure the Virginian's name a triumph), but rather the power of making all circumstances favour his schemes, of never losing an opportunity, often creating one, show generalship, the world has never beheld his superior. A very contrary belief has, strange to say, obtained advocates, not only in Europe, but in America. Even Jefferson declared that his extreme caution was better adapted for the methodical operations of a siege than for the more energetic displays of a pitched battle. We rather think that contemporaries, in some measure rivals, were scarcely fair judges of his powers; and that Mr. Parke Custis's partiality has carried him rather nearer the truth, notwithstanding his copious discharge of notes of interrogations: 'Did not this modern Fabius,' he writes, 'in the very depth of winter, and after overcoming mighty obstacles, surprise his enemy at Trenton, and recall victory to his standard, when hope was almost sinking in despair? Did he not, by a masterly manœuvre, and midnight march, surprise his enemy in Princeton and add yet another laurel to that already acquired by the capture of the Hessians? Did he not, with an army hastily raised, and defeated at Brandywine, in twenty-three days thereafter, surprise the enemy at Germantown? And though victory was denied him by a force of circumstances no human power could have controlled, yet the boldness of the enterprise, and the success attending it in the outset, produced such a confidence abroad in our courage and resources as to lead to our alliance with a powerful nation. Did he not surprise the enemy at Monmouth? And, although untoward events seemed to cripple the operations of the early part of the day, yet the setting sun shone upon the battle-field

'in possession of the Americans, the enemy retreating, and their dead and wounded left as trophies to the victors. Such were the memorable instances in which Washington, with troops newly raised, and badly provided with every necessary of war, struck at his veteran and well-appointed foe when least expected, producing the happiest influences upon the American cause both at home and abroad.'

The high authority of Jefferson has pronounced, that 'his heart was not warm in its affections;' and with that judgment the world in general seems readily to have concurred; yet with perhaps still less reason. He was reserved to the many from habit, and 'stern,' it is rightly said, 'to all whom he deemed wanting in those high moral requisites which dignify and adorn our nature. Stern he was to the disturbers of the repose of society, the violaters of those institutions which promote peace and good-will among men,' and could wither up with a glance impertinents like Governor Morris, who, for a bet, accosted the General with a rudely jocular slap on the shoulder; but there his austerity ended. If the jealous politicians of Congress could not always fairly estimate either his martial genius or his ready benevolence, at all events his soldiers and officers, all at least but his rivals, could and did thoroughly. To them his patience was not insensibility, and his coolness not coldness. When his aide-de-camp, Colonel Fitzgerald, cried for joy, at finding him escape uninjured from a desperate and triumphant effort to rally his men at Princeton, the reply by a brief order to do his duty and bring up the troops was not thought sullenness; nor again, when Hamilton, in his rage at General Lee's apparent treachery, leaping from his horse, proposed to make a forlorn attack on the enemy, was the calm command to him, to obey orders and mount till he was bid dismount, regarded by its impetuous object as a piece of unkindly irony against enthusiasm. On one occasion, described in this volume, when the troops were wearily plodding to their winter-quarters at Valley Forge, Washington's approach was announced. As he rode slowly up, he was observed to be eyeing very earnestly the frozen surface of the ground. He bade the commanding-officer come to him, and addressed him as follows: 'How comes it, sir, that I have tracked the march of your troops by the blood-stains of their feet?' The officer's reply was, that it was his regiment's misfortune to be among the last to be served; and the stores became exhausted before their turn came. 'The general was observed to be deeply affected by this description. His compressed lips, the heaving of his chest, betokened the powerful emotions that were struggling in his bosom, when, turning towards the troops,

'with a voice tremulous yet friendly, he exclaimed, "Poor fellows!" then, giving rein to his charger, rode away. During this touching interview, every eye was bent upon the chief, every ear was attentive to catch his words; and when those words reached the soldiers, a grateful but subdued expression burst from every lip of "God bless your excellency, your poor soldiers' friend!"' When a man's acts are always benevolent, it is wonderful how few words are needed to interpret them clearly enough. Congress was always voting studied panegyrics, but seldom sending shoes and pork; and thus the army was ever ready to convert the selfish panegyrical Speaker's mace into a royal sceptre for the taciturn, laborious commander.

His officers had the same feeling. His subordinate generals might, in the glow of their occasional triumphs, be tempted into caballing and sneering; but, in the day of reverse and general outcries, even a Horatio Gates turned, not in vain, to the justice of the man he had sought to supplant for protection. The account of Washington's demeanour, on hearing the news of General St. Clair's surprise in Ohio, by the Indians, lightens up, as by a sudden flash, the mysterious depths of his profound character, both bringing into relief the justice and fairness which made his soldiers and his often-murmuring officers rely on him in adversity; and also showing that the apparent equability of his temper was a carefully trained and fostered virtue, not a defect of nature. It was while at dinner on a winter's day, that he was called out to read the despatch. He soon returned, apologized for his absence, and attended to his wife's evening visitors with his customary courtesy. At last, he was left alone with his secretary, Mr. Lear. For some minutes, he walked up and down in silence; at length: "Yes," he burst forth, "here, on this very spot, I took leave of him; I wished him success and honour. I said, 'I will add but one word: beware of a surprise.' He went off with that as my last solemn warning thrown into his ears. And yet, to suffer that army to be cut to pieces, hacked by a surprise—the very thing I guarded him against! O God, O God! he is worse than a murderer! How can he answer it to his country? The blood of the slain is upon him—the curse of widows and orphans!" This torrent came out in tone appalling. His very frame shook. He sat down on the sofa once more. He was silent. He at length said, in an altered voice, "This must not go beyond this room." Another pause followed—a longer one—when he said, in a tone quite low, "General St. Clair shall have justice. I will hear him without prejudice; he shall have full justice." And from Washington St. Clair

had justice. 'The unfortunate general, worn down by age, disease, and the hardships of a frontier campaign—assailed by the press, and with the current of popular opinion setting hard against him—repaired to his chief, as to a shelter from the fury of so many elements. Washington extended his hand to one who appeared in no new character; for, during the whole of a long life, misfortune seemed "to have marked him for her own." Poor old St. Clair hobbled up, seized the offered hand in both of his, and gave vent to his feelings in an audible manner. He was subsequently tried by a commission of Government, and proved to have been *unfortunate*.' The world, in this case, and probably in many others, only witnessed the results of Washington's deliberation; it was merely by an accident that we know of how severe a struggle this generous forbearance to an unsuccessful lieutenant was the issue. Because he so ruled himself as not to run the risk of having to award the slow and altogether inadequate compensation of an apology through prejudging an imputed offence, men who saw no manifestation of indignation inferred that he felt none. On the contrary, those who knew him well have allowed that he was naturally of a quick and violent temper, nobly controlled. Perhaps only on one occasion was it suffered to run its course freely. After the war, a friend of General Scott, whose every other word was an oath, endeavouring to break him of the habit by holding up to him the example of his late commander, asked him if Washington ever swore. 'Scott reflected for a moment, and then exclaimed, "Yes, once. It was at Monmouth, and on a day that would have made any one swear. Yes, sir, he swore on that day till the leaves shook on the trees—charming, delightful! Never have I enjoyed such swearing before or since! Sir, on that ever-memorable day, he swore like an angel from heaven!" It was superfluous to add to this account that the reformer abandoned his friend in despair.

We believe that, even in other matters, Washington's coolness and serenity of deportment has caused some injustice to be done to his very remarkable powers of intellect and knowledge of human character. It is as though his morality had been praised at the expense of his sagacity. The following anecdote about the General's intercourse with Rivington, editor of the *Royal Gazette* at New York, while in the occupation of the king's troops, and a most unscrupulous calumniator of the revolutionary leaders, seems to show that he knew how to avail himself of secret services, and to profit by the corruptibility of humanity. 'When Washington entered New York, on its evacuation by the British forces, he said one morning to two of his officers, "Suppose, gentlemen, we walk down to Rivington's

‘book-store; he is said to be a very pleasant kind of a fellow.’ ‘Amazed as the officers were at the idea of visiting such a man, they of course prepared to accompany the chief. When arrived, Rivington received his visitors with great politeness, for he was, indeed, one of the most elegant gentlemen and best ‘bred men of the age;’ (and wore curled and powdered hair, claret-coloured coat, scarlet waistcoat, trimmed with gold lace, buckskin breeches, and top-boots). ‘Escorting the party into a parlour, he begged the officers to be seated, and then said to the chief, “Will your excellency do me the honour to step into the adjoining room for a moment, that I may show you a list of the agricultural works I am about to order out from London for your special use?” They retired. The locks on the doors of houses in New York, more than threescore years ago, were not so good as now. The door of Rivington’s private room closed very imperfectly, and soon became ajar, when the officers distinctly heard the chinking of two heavy purses of gold as they were successively placed on the table.’ It is said that Rivington had communicated with Washington by binding his billets in the covers of the books he published. He trusted to selling these to the spies who were ignorant of the special nature of their service, by whom they were sure to be conveyed to Washington’s head-quarters.

We wonder what the same depreciators of the General’s readiness and acuteness at the head of an army will think of the following anecdote:—

‘The bearer of one despatch was a young man named Montagnie, who was directed by Washington to cross the river at King’s Ferry, proceed by Haverstraw to the Ramapo Clove, and through the pass to Morristown. Montagnie, knowing the Ramapo Pass to be in possession of the friends of the enemy, ventured to suggest to the commander-in-chief that the upper road would be the safest. “I shall be taken,” he said, “if I go through the Clove.” “Your duty, young man, is not to talk, but to obey!” replied Washington sternly, enforcing his words by a vigorous stamp of his foot. Montagnie proceeded as directed, and, near the Ramapo Pass, was caught, and sent to New York. The day after his arrival, the contents of the despatches taken from him were published in *Rivington’s Gazette*, with great parade, for they indicated a plan of attack upon the city.’

When they had exhausted their time and preparations, the British and Montagnie learned, at the same time, that meanwhile Washington had had leisure to concert and execute a movement in quite a different direction, and that the messenger’s capture was not entirely accidental.

Under the same temperate calmness, which seems to have deceived so many into considering him rather contemptuously as a natural stoic—a passionless man—he sheltered a high and generous moral courage, which, though he was not a man to scorn or outrage public opinion, enabled him on occasion to brave and to shame it. Robert Morris was the great financier of the Revolution. To his courageous confidence in its eventual success it was indebted for the pecuniary supplies which kept its army from perishing. Yet this man, impoverished by land speculations from which Washington had tried to dissuade him, his country suffered to spend the last years of his life in the debtors' prison at Philadelphia. Well may Mr. Custis exclaim: 'For Robert Morris to have been imprisoned *in character*, the bars should have been of gold!' It is a noble reminiscence of Washington, that in 1798, when he came to Philadelphia, as commander-in-chief, to superintend the organization of his last army, unmindful of the pomp which welcomed his arrival, he paid his first visit to the prison-house of Robert Morris. On another occasion, the death of his step-son, who was seized with the camp-fever when attending him as aide-de-camp at Yorktown, his manly grief gives the lie to the accounts which represent him as faultless because all but heartless. It was in the moment of triumph and exultation at the crowning event of the war, the surrender of Earl Cornwallis, when, the tidings having arrived at Philadelphia at night, the watchmen were calling the hours with the suffix, 'and Cornwallis is taken,' that the news that there was no longer hope, reached him. 'The anxious watchers by the couch of the dying were in the grey of the twilight roused by a trampling of horse, and looking out, discovered the commander-in-chief alighting from a jaded charger in the courtyard. To his eager inquiry, "Is there any hope?" the physician mournfully shook his head. The general retired to a room to indulge his grief, requesting to be left alone. In a little while the sufferer expired. Washington, tenderly embracing the bereaved wife and mother, said, "From this moment I adopt his two youngest children as my own." Absorbed in grief, he then waived with his hand a melancholy adieu, and fresh horses being ready, without rest or refreshment, remounted, and returned to the camp thirty miles off.'

Indeed, if ever there was a man who can be taken as an example of the *τετράγωνος ἀνὴρ*, the *four-square* man of Aristotle, that man was Washington. If his virtues had been the result solely of a passionless calm of temperament, as so many have represented, he would be but a very imperfect

example of the Aristotelian type of complete humanity. The anecdotes given in this volume show, that it was not because he wanted fire in his disposition, that his demeanour was so serene, but because his love of justice, his determination never to condemn, though he captured an offender red-handed, was so entire. He might be taken, we think, far, very far, more fitly, by Mr. Carlyle, than the father of Frederick the Great, to exemplify the dumb-poetic type of humanity, the character which feels and develops the poetry of action and of an energetic life. When we compare this great man with those who co-operated with him in consummating the American Revolution, we perceive yet more vividly both the grandeur and the splendour of his character. There were fine fellows among his officers, like General Nash, who, with thigh shattered by a round shot, and at the point of death, covered his wound with both his hands, and called out gaily to his men, "Never mind me; I have had 'a devil of a tumble! Rush on, my boys, I'll be after you 'presently!'" or, like Morgan, the leader of the Virginian Woodsmen, and hero of the battle of the Cowpens; but the revolutionary party had not a single general, except Washington, who was more than a brave partisan in a guerilla warfare. Washington was not only a skilful and most accomplished commander-in-chief—though such he must most certainly be esteemed—but he was more; he was a man with an idea of the times, and who could develop his idea in action. More completely even than Cromwell, than William III., or than Mirabeau, in their respective scenes of action, was he the leader and the hero of the Colonial War of Independence. He was not personally their superior, or the equal of the first; but he infinitely more overtopped his contemporaries and rivals. It is but the bare and simple truth to speak of the *necessity* of him to the army, and also to the constitution of America.

Washington in time of peace was, even in the midst of consummate politicians like John Adams, and Jefferson, and Hamilton, as conspicuous and pre-eminent as in war, where he had no rival. What some of his countrymen have accounted defects in his habits enlarged his efficiency. His old Virginian aristocratic tone of feeling and manners for instance, prevented the people from missing the pomp and ceremonial of the former royal governors, and sustained in the upper classes that interest in the government of their country, the disappearance of which in more modern times is so dangerous and ruinous a feature in the United States. It is not, in fact, quite accurate to say, as does Mr. Custis, that 'there never lived a man more averse to show and pomp than Washington.' There was, assuredly, never any

one with less of vanity; but some little show his early associations and reminiscences of the old state of things in Virginia made seem to his mind part of the decencies and proprieties of high station even in a republic. That he had not lost 'the genteel taste for fine cloathes,' as Walton expresses it in speaking of George Herbert, which marks his commissions to his London agents before the war; or for fine equipages, as when, in the precincts of the vice-regal court at Williamsburgh, in the days of the old *régime*, Colonel Washington's bays vied with Colonel Byrd's greys, is abundantly proved by the cream-coloured English coach, with panels painted by Cipriani, with groups of the Seasons, and its six shining bay horses, which was one of the sights of Philadelphia; and the purple satin dress, or rich black velvet, with diamond knee-buckles, scrupulously japanned shoes and buckles, ruffles, powder, bag, and dress-sword of his presidential days; all being adorned by a manner most courteous without being formal, a singularly attractive smile, eyes which could flash and glow on occasion, and an expression of countenance, grave, but not stern, which no painter could catch, and by a form declared by Lafayette to be the most superb he had ever beheld. The internal arrangements of his household were all decorous and dignified. There was no useless parade or expense: he always himself scrupulously inspected his weekly accounts; but there was, at the same time, nothing sordid; and though not of a disposition to diminish needlessly his patrimony, he freely spent the produce of the sale of a very considerable estate to eke out the state salary. We find amusingly described in the 'Recollections' the awful neatness of the President's stables: the horses enveloped, the night before they were to be ridden, in a white paste; the ostlers hard at work rubbing this off before dawn; the overseer with a muslin handkerchief in his hand, on which, when applied to the animals' coats, if the slightest stain were perceptible, down came the whip: then Fraunces, the steward of magnificent ideas, who, to reproaches on the score of waste, would reply with tears and the exclamation, "He may kill me if he will; but while he 'is president, and I have the honour to be his steward, 'his establishment shall have the best of everything,'" even the solitary shad of the season, at three dollars the fish, though the master's indignation at the cost might consign the luxury to the servants' hall; and Uncle Harkless, the chief cook, sauntering with the dandies up Market Street, in silk, with cocked hat and gold-headed cane, to glorify the presidential establishment.

Washington knew how to preserve simplicity of manner and thought amid some magnificence of living. Some few might

murmur at, for instance, his *levées* and his wife's drawing-rooms as verging on monarchical etiquette and formality; but on the whole the nation approved and liked to have a chief who could live like a prince, and feel and talk like a citizen among citizens. The voluntary celebration of his birthday by a ball in every great town showed that the endurance of Presidential ceremonies was not deemed by republican America a forced discharge of the debt of gratitude due to its great liberator.

Perhaps the most interesting portions of the book are the accounts of Washington at Mount Vernon, when released from the command of the army, and, at length, from the cares of civil office. A part of each day was always set apart for meditation and devotion; nor this in time of peace only; for we are told that 'one day, while the Americans were encamped at Valley Forge, the owner of the house occupied by the General, a Quaker, strolled up the creek, and, when not far from his mill, heard a solemn voice. He walked quietly in the direction of it, and saw Washington's horse tied to a sapling. In a thicket near by was the chief, upon his knees in prayer, his cheeks suffused with tears.' He rose generally about four: the library, and a visit to the stables, occupied the time till breakfast; and then he regularly every day made the tour of his farms, without attendants, opening his gates, pulling down and pulling up his fences as he passed, with compass in hand, and in his plain drab clothes, broad-brimmed white hat, with a hickory switch and umbrella with long staff attached to his saddle-bow, the ideal of a gentleman farmer, who did all things, from the inauguration of a constitution to the planting of a tobacco-field, with his whole heart and soul. Precisely at a quarter to three, his horse's hoofs were heard approaching the door, for whether it were the pit of a theatre, or Congress, a band of expectant maidens with laurel wreaths, or a British army, or even a cook, Washington never kept any one waiting. At three, dinner was served: a late guest had only to make apologies to himself; and after four or five glasses of Madeira, the host retired to write letters in his library, rejoining his family at tea, whence, after much talk and reading aloud of newspapers, at nine he went off to bed. His great delight after his retirement was in improving his Mount Vernon estate, where he was his own architect and surveyor. His correspondence with men like Sir John Sinclair and Arthur Young was minute and extensive; and the most acceptable presents to the ex-President from American statesmen or foreign sovereigns were animals of a good breed, or specimens of useful plants and trees. Nor, while attending to the decoration of his mansion and grounds, laying out deer-parks (which, by-the-by, supplied the neighbourhood with venison, while the owner's love

of his game denied the Mount Vernon table a single haunch), and paving colonnades with foreign marbles, was he careless of his servants' comfort. He took care that he got from them a fair day's work, but he felt that property had its reciprocal duties. Within certain limits he even considered them free to do, if they chose, what he himself most strongly disapproved, as a copy, in his handwriting, of a contract between a drunken gardener and himself quaintly demonstrates. It was therein agreed, that Philip Barter, for the considerations therein mentioned, was not at any time to suffer himself to be 'disguised with liquor, except on times hereinafter mentioned;' that is to say, that the said George Washington was, among other things, to pay him 'four dollars at Christmas, with which he may be 'drunk four days and four nights; two dollars at Easter to 'effect the same purpose; two dollars at Whitsuntide to be 'drunk for two days.'

It is not unusual to intimate that Washington's character was not so portentous a phenomenon in the America of his day as it seems now; that Virginia, at all events, could have furnished many examples of a like English gentlemanly simplicity; and this seems to be supposed in the frequent lamentations of Americans, that 'the aspect of Congress in those old times was 'very different from what we now witness. There was an air 'of decorum, of composure, of reflection, of gentlemanly and 'polished dignity, which has fled, or lingers only with here and 'there a relic of the olden time.' We can hardly think so. A careful consideration of the characters of really great men like Patrick Henry and Jefferson, the leaders of the old Congress, and the Randolphs and Peytons, who predominated in the Virginian Assembly, scarcely bears out an inference that Washington's pre-eminence was merely in degree. These men certainly could emulate, though not, perhaps, surpass him, in the good taste of their equipages, and the splendour of their entertainments; but we find just the same sort of exaggeration, verging close upon the ludicrous, in their deportment and oratory, as in that of their modern successors. It has been said of Washington, that he was always the same; that even in his social hours his friends felt for him a certain veneration and awe. This was not the result of a perpetual stiffness and inflexibility of mien (which certainly does not tend to win respect); for he could walk a minuet in the days of his glory with complaisance, and in his youth with rapture; and amidst the cares of state, find time to chide a schoolboy for idling, and admonish smilingly a coquette. It flowed rather from what is justly described as 'the strongest, most ever-present sense of propriety that ever

'human being possessed, impressing the observer with a conviction that he was exactly and fully equal to what he had to do.' It was just this admirable power of proportioning, not merely the action, but even the thought and the feeling to the occasion, which distinguishes him from his otherwise great contemporaries. 'He was the only man,' said Lord Erskine of him, 'whose character he could not contemplate without awe and wonder.' We believe that the judgment of posterity will not vary from this, and that if any man could have, he had a right, when dying, to exclaim, as he did, 'I am dying, but am not afraid to die !'

ART. IV.—*Life and Letters of John Angell James.* Nisbet.

JOHN ANGELL JAMES has been so long a name in the Non-conformist world, and as an acknowledged leader he took so conspicuous a part in the popular religious movements of a long and busy period, that we make no apology for introducing his biography to our readers, especially as his biographer and eulogist has shown himself very well equal to his task. Of course we expect enthusiasm for his subject, and a strong bias for Congregationalism from Mr. James's friend, colleague, and eventual successor; but he has compiled a book full of information not only for the Society to which, as far as there is any cohesion in it, he belongs, but also for all who are interested in the history of popular religion and its various developments. For this general purpose, probably, no better central figure could have been chosen than Angell James, from the long period in which he occupied a prominent place, from his influence with his party in England and America, from his practical powers and spirit of ascendancy adapting him to take the lead, and also from the weight of his private character and unusually consistent career. Though not seldom engaged in active opposition and controversy with 'the Establishment,' he became from these causes an authority with the Low-Church party, and many of those movements which, on the plea of a more general and 'Catholic' unity, led the clergy to coalesce with Dissenters, and to separate themselves in the same proportion from their own brethren, have their origin in him. The meetings for united prayer, where, in our large towns, clergy and dissenting ministers pray by turns and acknowledge no difference in calling or authority, began under his auspices. With him originated the first idea of the Evangelical Alliance, from the first minutes of which, as a matter of avowed expediency rather than principle, he thought it wise to exclude any formal protest against prelacy, saying, 'If we take up the latter' (antagonism to prelacy) 'we cannot carry Episcopalians with us;' adding, however, 'not, indeed, that I expect any disposition' 'on their part, or, at least, the bulk of them, to confederate.'

He laboured strenuously in the cause of Revivals, catching the enthusiasm from his American brethren, and in connexion

with this movement wrote his principal work, 'The Anxious Inquirer,' a little book as popular with the Low-Church school as with Dissenters, and based on disbelief in the Church doctrine concerning baptism. The method and steadiness of his personal character enabled him to wield these various engines of religious excitement with a discretion which inspired confidence. If the principles of the religion and the party to which he belonged, naturally lead to extremes, his own nature was averse to them, or rather, he had a caution always at work in spite of himself, which held him in check, and would have made extravagances of any sort sit uneasy upon him. He was one of the men to make the best of the circumstances in which he was placed, but not to see his way out of them. Circumstances in his case made him a Nonconformist, and he accepted the position, as it seems, without having once been disturbed by a moment's doubt. Religion and society, from his earliest boyhood, must have been regarded from the Dissenting point of view, and he received without a question the traditions of this school. Thus he had no tendency to schism; his loyalty to the party in which he found himself may imply, perhaps, at least an equal loyalty had he been born and bred a son of the Church; and his essentially practical mind led him naturally rather to turn what he possessed to use, than to investigate its grounds, or doubt its value or completeness. The particulars of his early life explain much of his subsequent career.

His father was a linen-draper, of Blandford Forum, in Dorsetshire, of an old though obscure family, with a roll of 'pious progenitors' going two hundred years back, to whom were attached traditions of persecution and trial for conscience' sake. Both his father and mother inherited Dissent. His father he speaks of as a common-place character, punctual in his place at meeting, but more occupied in his business, especially in the manufacture of buttons, than in the assertion of his religious convictions, except where both these interests met; as when he found himself in London on Good Friday, and wrote—'Yesterday, being called Good Friday, of course no business was done, 'so that I may reckon a day lost.' His mother was more earnest in her religion; the son calls her a good, but not a great woman, which is a grandiloquent way of saying that she had more feeling than sense. She had been brought up a Baptist, which accounts for his not being baptized till near his ordination. He describes her as so fervent in prayer that she could be heard far beyond the precincts of her closet; a practice in which he owns to have followed her example, incurring much ridicule thereby, till experience taught more reserve. One of these fervent prayers the mother pronounced over her son in infancy, which he

ever after remembered, and to which he traced his subsequent course. Beyond this his parents do not seem to have occupied themselves much with his religious training; at eight years old he was sent for two years to a rough village boarding-school to learn reading and arithmetic, and here, perhaps for the only time of his life, he went to church; but his companions were disorderly, he learnt to swear, applied himself more to fighting than his lessons, and seems in after-life to have associated all together as a season of irreligion. He was next put under an Arian preacher, where he learnt a little Latin. That it was not more, he ever after regretted, feeling very acutely in after years the deficiencies of his early education; but in boyhood he had no taste for learning, and was always getting into scrapes, so that his mother acknowledged to a neighbour that 'her son John was her chief trouble,' though, probably, he manifested no real ill disposition, as her friend consoled her with the argument that as he was clever at play the boy 'would do well enough by and by.' In due time his father apprenticed him to a linen-draper, with 'a member of the Independent Church, at Poole,' a professor, but hardly acting up to his profession. Respect for his mother, he tells us, preserved him from open irreligion; he regularly attended meeting, and listened to high Calvinism, interspersed with anecdotes, from a disciple of Whitfield. Calvinism, we presume, if anything, is the essential creed of Congregationalists, who used to be popularly called Calvinists, and in theory Angell James always avowed himself a follower of Calvin, but it never quite commended itself to his practical mind, or mixed much in his preaching. At the close of the volume occurs a passage on this head:—

'At a time when there was a great deal of talk about the supposed decline of orthodoxy among the younger ministers, Mr. James, in conversation with a young minister, was expressing the apprehensions which he often uttered in public; his companion, who thought his apprehensions groundless, and saw that he was in a desponding mood, looked up and said, rather mischievously, "Well, Mr. James, you know that I am more orthodox than you are."

"What! what!" was his reply, with a puzzled and amused look; "how do you make that out?"

"At least I am more Calvinistic than you."

"No, sir," said Mr. James, raising his closed hand to give emphasis to his words; "I hold the doctrines of Calvinism with a firm grasp."

"But, sir, you never preach about them, and I do."

"Well," he replied, rather slowly, "there's not so much about them in the Bible."

"That proves what I say, sir," answered the younger minister; "you don't half believe them."

'This conversation, though only half in earnest on one side, indicates Mr. James's real position. In creed he was a moderate Calvinist, belonging to the school of his predecessor, Dr. Williams, but his temperament led him to dwell much more on Christian duty than on Christian privilege.'—Pp. 617, 618.

When about fifteen he describes himself as beginning to feel and to think more of religion, and as praying at intervals; for the practice of daily private prayer seems to have been new to him till a new apprentice came, whom he observed to kneel and say his prayers the night of his arrival. He regarded this young man as sent in answer to his own prayers, accepted him as his guide, and was soon introduced by him to a new teacher, a 'pious cobbler,' who, living in a dirty hovel, and not very clean himself, seems to have possessed some unusual power over the class so few can influence. There Angell James contracted some friendships with young men of his own standing, all seemingly zealous for religion, spending many 'sweet and sacred seasons' together; but whose subsequent career led him to the conclusion that they had never really felt the power of religion, though no experience could have enabled him to decide this, we should say, till after the event. The treatment of the young; the mode in which religion is commended to them; the assumption in them, one and all, of irreligion, till a certain, stated, perfectly recognisable moment, is one of the curious points of this book. Of the three apprentices who began their religious career with Angell James, one died a follower of Tom Paine; another became a 'drunken profligate;' the third, who had brought him to the cobbler, led a wandering unsatisfactory life, and wrote to him at its close, 'that all the time of their acquaintance he 'had been a stranger to the power of true religion.' Angell James was of another mould; his convictions were sincere, and he immediately put into practice what he learnt.

'It will be seen by what I have related that my religious character was a gradual, and not a sudden formation: there was no pungent conviction of sin, no poignancy of godly sorrow, no great and rapid transition of feeling, nor any very clear illumination of knowledge; but there were many evidences of a real change. My delight in prayer was very great; when alone in the shop, when riding in the country on my employer's business, I could not help pouring out my heart to God. In one thing, as I have already said, I was extremely injudicious, and that was, I allowed my feelings so far to get the upper hand of my judgment as to pray so loud, that though I was in the attic, I was heard in the lower parts of the house, and exposed both myself and the exercise I was engaged in to no small degree of ridicule.'—Pp. 34, 35.

With this school there is no interval between religious impressions and the endeavour to influence other minds. No sooner did this youth learn to pray, than his voice is familiar as leading prayer in their prayer-meetings—a voice in his case of such power as no doubt to be felt by all as a sort of call to the only career which would give it full exercise. And very little rest it seems to have had for the sixty years that follow upon its first publicity. We doubt if to such a character mere amusements would ever have possessed much charm. And it

is noticed of him that he could not endure fiction. He was one always to find delight in his work, and naturally to lead in that work. From the time that religion occupied his thoughts, it became also the absorbing business of his life. We do not, therefore, attach much importance to his confessions of declension at this early period, or believe that in eschewing the ordinary diversions of his age, he was overcoming any real temptation.

'I one time gave occasion to my good friend the shoemaker to grieve over me, by going to an election ball; not that I danced, for I was never taught, but merely went for an hour or two to see what was going on. It was more a matter of curiosity, and of petty vanity at having an opportunity of going to a ball, than any particular taste for such things; but I ought not to have been there. My then present feelings were incompatible with such amusements. My pious friend, who watched over me with a jealous eye, wisely reproved me, and with such a delicate gentleness as endeared him to my heart. I was also betrayed by curiosity into another inconsistency, and that was to go and see a mimic play, got up by a few young men of the town. While in the room, my conscience so severely reproved me, that its accusations were like scorpion stings. I was situated under a large beam, and I trembled through my whole frame lest it should fall and crush me to death. As soon as I could, I left the place, and jumped for joy when I found myself safe on the outside of the house. I mention these things to prove that there may be a work of grace going on in the soul when some appearances in young converts would lead us to suspect the reality of the change. Even after the soul is converted to God, it does not see all at once the full extent of its duty. Corruption gets for a little while the upper hand in the struggle.'—P. 33.

He describes himself at this time as courting religious excitement, and encouraging tears, and other outward manifestations of feeling. He became a Sunday-school teacher, which we find does not imply being a 'professor.' 'I never,' he says, 'became a professor of religion at Poole, for I was never invited to join 'in the communion of the Church.' But in teaching the children of his class he felt a facility and power, leading him to desire a field of wider usefulness, which naturally developed into a call to the ministry. His father was unwilling at first to sacrifice the sum he had given as premium, but offered no real opposition, and at seventeen he was sent to the Nonconformist College at Gosport.

A great deal is said on the subject of education for the ministry, both in Mr. James's own words and by the biographer, Mr. Dale. Each is anxious to assert his opinion in favour of a learned ministry, and to impress upon the reader the improvement of modern times upon the old system practised in their colleges.

'During the last forty years the system of ministerial education among English Congregationalists has undergone a complete transformation; and Mr. James's account of his life at Gosport, under the care of Dr. Bogue, has all the interest which belongs to a trustworthy narrative of customs now almost

obsolete. Just here and there a few candidates for the ministry are still gathered under the roof of a laborious man, who occupies at the same time the pulpit and the professor's chair, and superintends the reading of his students in the most dissimilar and remote departments of learning; lectures to-day on Original Sin, and to-morrow on Jupiter's Satellites; passes from Xenophon to Homiletics, and from Tacitus to the principles of Church Polity; and the earnestness and ability with which these numerous and conflicting duties are discharged, and the ministerial success of some of the students from these unambitious seminaries, awaken astonishment and admiration. But a new epoch, which Mr. James himself helped to inaugurate, has now begun. Non-conformist colleges are attempting to secure for the ministry a more liberal and learned education than the private academies were able to impart.'—P. 44.

And Mr. James in a mingled strain of humility and self-appreciation which belongs to those who have been successful under difficulties, writes:—

'When I think of the advantages enjoyed by the students of our own times in the present improved system of education in our colleges, and recollect that they have in some cases six years to pursue their studies, I could almost weep to think of my own disadvantages. When I see what men are now presiding over the studies of our colleges, it seems to me as if *now* I could gladly go and sit down at their feet, to repair, at the approaching end of my course, the disadvantages I suffered at the commencement. O favoured students, know, value, improve your privileges! No man has ever been more conscious of his defects than I am of mine. No man ought to have more excuse made for him than myself. It is not surprising that I cannot write in such a pure classic style of elegance as they can who have had a more perfect education. How should I? Yet, through God's most abounding goodness, I have not been idle, or useless, or unknown. I have become an author of works, neither few, nor neglected, nor unblessed, written in good plain idiomatic Saxon language; and most of them written but once. To me my career is more wonderful than anything I have ever known; I mean, that one so partially educated, so limited in his attainments, so confined in his knowledge, should have acquired a standing such as has been assigned me in this extraordinary age. Instead of lifting me up with pride, it humbles me in the dust—for, in addition to my original defective education, I have had the disadvantage, as in one respect I may call it, of having been placed in a situation so public, and requiring such constant demands upon me, that I have had little time for reading and study, and for thus making up my original defects.'—Pp. 53, 54.

The man who 'can write in good plain idiomatic Saxon language,' perhaps has no just ground of quarrel with his education. When Mr. James has anything to say, he certainly can say it distinctly; there is a letter of remonstrance on this very subject of education, demanding from the London Missionary Society that they should fulfil their pledges to their students, of giving them something like real education, before sending them to their work, which is most creditable both for feeling and point, and remarkable, as coming from a 'professor of religion,' and addressed to a college of professors, for its perfect freedom from cant and conventional phraseology. In his sermons, Mr. James seems to have been flowery, but his written style no doubt profits by his sense of his own defi-

ciencies. He evidently feels that his safety lies in taking the shortest way to his end. In this, his language forms an agreeable contrast, not with that of his Editor, or his son, both of whom express themselves clearly and unaffectedly, but with some more elaborate specimens of Congregational English. There are quotations from the writings of Mr. Guest, the minister of Taunton, who received his education in Spring Hill College, a seminary embodying all the modern improvements, and to which Mr. James devoted so much time and interest, which conveys a painful idea of effort at fine writing. One sentence begins—

“Desiring to perpetuate the remembrance of the honours that gathered around the obsequies, and to indicate the impression made by them upon a visitor, I devote a page to record the scene.”—P. 528.

In addition to his classical and theological labours, our young student was put at once on the preaching list, and at seventeen went out to preach to village congregations. He never seems to have found any difficulty in this department of his work; and in early life undertook the most arduous duties, without apparently any misgiving. There, again, we see the influence of a voice, which we are convinced sounds in a young preacher's ears like the applause of friends, and staves off importunate fears. He only stayed two years at Gosport, and while yet only nineteen, entered upon the scene of his life-long labours. ‘The congregation worshipping in Carr's Lane, Birmingham,’ were in trouble about their minister, Mr. Brewer, a popular man and powerful preacher, but who had been guilty of some act of immorality, for which the authorities of the meeting-house dismissed him. Brewer went, carrying more than half the congregation with him; and they had a pastor to seek for. Angell James was sent as a ‘supply,’ but made so great an impression, in his first sermon, on his audience, that they almost immediately decided on keeping him amongst them. He had entered upon what was to prove the scene of a life's labours, with an easy confidence in himself, which surprised him in after years.

‘Consequences such as have resulted never rose before my mind. I was going to preach, and that was all. I was but little troubled then, as I have sadly been since, with nervous disorder. I thought less on Saturday night, and slept sounder than I do now when going to preach a Sabbath in a neighbouring town. I am afraid it was not so much the fervour of my piety and the simplicity of my confidence in God, as the thoughtlessness of youth.’—P. 67.

* * * * *

‘I cannot forget the impression produced on my mind by the first view I had of my future flock. The way to the pulpit was from the vestry through a door in the wall, so that I came at once upon the congregation without any preparation. There was no crowd to appal me, for in a place that with one gallery would seat about eight hundred persons, there were probably not more than a hundred and fifty, so that, in this respect, the sight was anything but encou-

raging; but what impressed me was the unusual number, in proportion, of venerable persons. There were nine or ten as respectable elderly gentlemen as are usually collected in a congregation several times the size. It looked like an assembly of the ancients. This a little appalled me, but I do not recollect that it discomposed me.

'My first text was, 1 John iii. 1, 2, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God," &c. First impressions are important to success, and those, I believe, were decidedly in my favour. The subject was interesting, and as it was a sermon I had, of course, often preached before, I had it pretty much at command, and being self-possessed to an unusual degree for so young a man, I gained a lodgment in the hearts of the people from that morning. If I mistake not, my text in the afternoon was, John i. 14, "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," &c. A bold and adventurous flight for so young a preacher! However, it proved me at once to be sound on the subject of Christ's divinity, a truth dear to the minds and hearts of the pious.'—P. 68.

After he had preached 'four Sabbaths with much acceptance,' the elders of the congregation offered him the pastorate. Seven venerable old gentlemen came to offer to this boy the charge of their souls. He was perfectly equal to the occasion, without—he thought on a review of the scene—being unduly lifted up by it. His formal acceptance of the invitation is conveyed in an epistle, beginning with an apostolic form of salutation, and expressed throughout with a gravity, unction, and business-like precision, which prove in the youth of nineteen a precocious aptitude for government. Nor does he ever by a single youthful indiscretion forfeit the prestige of his inauguration. At the close of his life he can congratulate himself on never having committed a great mistake, and certainly it is marked by a consistency, and a uniformity of aim, which characterises few lives. He removed at once to Birmingham, and entered on his work.

Amongst the subjects taught from the professor's chair at Gosport had been rules for a discreet matrimonial choice. Marriage seems almost as imperative a necessity in the Congregational ministry as it is in the Greek Church, and here the students were instructed how to choose a wife. From Christian graces the teacher passed by a natural step to other requirements. He recommended his students 'not to seek great riches—not to marry for money's sake, but, if possible, not without money.' This is a point which all advocates, and exponents of the voluntary system, seem to regard as its correlative, without which it cannot be expected to succeed. The minister must not marry without money. Thus indoctrinated, it is no wonder that the homeless young minister, arrived at his destination, began to fulfil the law of his class, and to look out for a wife. If there is a point on which he prides himself in reviewing his career, it is his choice in this particular; and twice he had the opportunity of evincing his prudence and discrimination, for his first wife only lived ten years. Writing in old age of this period, he has

evidently in mind the importance of impressing on the students of his day the principles which had guided his choice, passing on, as it were, the traditionary teaching which had influenced his own youth. If we are disposed to be diverted by the gravity, unconscious of ridicule, with which the subject is treated, we fully acquiesce in the convenience of the arrangement, not only for young Congregational ministers, but also for many in our own Establishment. It is the inculcating from high quarters such considerations as a deliberate rule of action that we object to. As a matter of fact, it so constantly falls in with a law of fitness that ladies of fortune should marry clergymen disqualified by their unremunerating profession from increasing their own inadequate incomes, there is often so exact an interchange of secular and even higher advantages in such a union, the husband acquiring leisure and freedom from care in the exercise of his functions, the wife gaining a position at once of dignity and usefulness, that no one can withhold unfeigned approval and satisfaction in such a right adjustment of things. But whenever the chair of authority and popular opinion unite to recommend our young clergy to 'marry money,' and they set themselves deliberately to follow the advice, we still shall feel that the Church is secularizing fast, and that the people love to have it so.

Mr. James gives the history of his first marriage in a very straightforward manner, and with confidence that his whole course of action was under the immediate direction of Divine providence.

'Among my congregation were two sisters of the name of Smith—Mary, and Frances Charlotte. They were the daughters of Dr. Smith, a respectable physician of the town, lately deceased. Their father, before his death, had furnished for them, in prospect of his departure, a house only two doors below that in which Mr. Frears lived. I was thus thrown into the company of these ladies, especially by meeting them at Mrs. Walford's, an aged, pious, and most intelligent woman, and an intimate friend first of Dr. Smith—who wished to marry her—and then of his daughters. Mrs. Walford lived exactly opposite the house occupied by the ladies. My attention was soon directed to Fanny, the youngest. I had been one day most earnestly praying for Divine direction in this important step, and during prayer Frances Smith occurred with such force to my mind, that I considered it an indication of Providence that my attention should be directed to her, to which I was encouraged by Mrs. Walford, her intimate friend; and on December 2, 1805, I made known to her my attachment, and my wishes to obtain her hand and heart. I was accepted. As she was living in her own house, there was no need of long delay, and on the 7th of July the following year we were married at the parish church of Edgbaston: so that I had only to remove from my kind friend, Mr. Frears', to the next door but one, where was everything made ready to my hand.'—P. 90.

We should not quarrel with this if Mr. James did not at the same time take pains to prove that he was not consulting his own

natural feelings in this step. He says that 'God chose for me better than I should have chosen for myself,' a statement, we think, incompatible with those stirrings of affection which should prompt the thought of marriage; and in order to impress upon his reader the peculiarly providential and holy character of this union, he actually indulges in a strain of disparagement in the matter of those merely natural charms and graces which lovers see, or at least think they see, in the object of their choice. He had no business, we maintain, to tell the world that from first to last he was very conscious that his wife was plain.

'This dear and eminent woman had few personal charms, but her countenance was intelligent and thoughtful, with a cast of mild and reserved benevolence. Her character, spirit, and temper, were a combination of matured female excellence. She had little sprightliness or vivacity; was not obtrusive in conversation, yet was not taciturn, but ever ready with invariable good sense to bear her part in the ordinary subjects of discourse. Her demeanour was grave, but by no means gloomy. Profoundly humble, and beautifully meek, she could never offend, and was rarely offended; though I have known her roused to dignified displeasure on some occasions, both before and after our marriage. Her prudence, sound good sense, sobriety of mind, and correctness of judgment were exemplary. All this was veiled by a delicate and invariable modesty, and sanctified by eminent piety. After our marriage, when she became better known to the congregation, she was hailed as an angel of God, and I believe that there was not an individual in either the church or the congregation to whom she was not an object of love, interest, and esteem.'—Pp. 91, 92.

Possibly, however, the old man thought it for edification to disclaim all illusions. There may have been more natural feeling in the affair than he could remember. There was evidently in this connexion the charm of a social rise. Miss Smith was thought by her friends to be doing ill for herself. He implies that this lady and her successor were in manners above those amongst whom they moved, he attributes to both 'patrician bearing,' and ease and grace of manner. Any charm people are not used to, affects the imagination like beauty. This lady, the mother of his children, of whom he always speaks with warm affection, only lived ten years.

It is remarkable, considering Mr. James's wide popularity in after years, that the commencement of his ministry should have been an acknowledged failure; for seven years his congregations were small, and but few new members were added to the books. This was probably owing to a reaction from early strain. He himself attributed it to want of care in the preparation of his sermons—to trusting too much to his ready flow, and perhaps to his voice. But preachers with 'a very free command of sonorous, if not 'accurate English, and with a voice which, for sweetness, richness, and pathos, has been rarely equalled, never surpassed,' can generally find hearers. It is far more likely that his energies

were overtaken both by previous excitement, and by (what his biographer does not notice here) the necessity of preaching three sermons every Sunday: a burden which was remitted after seven years, when an assistant was provided. During this period, he endeavoured to make up for a deficient education by reading and study; and at length, by a singular instrumentality, shone out into publicity. During the repairs of his own chapel, he occupied the 'Unitarian pulpit;' there his merits became known, though his editor is careful to explain that this was the occasion, not the cause, of the sudden increase of popularity. The eclipse was over by 1812, when these early years of disappointment suddenly gave way to a career of success. Mr. Thomas Wilson, of Highbury, the leading layman of his sect, brought him forward, appointing him one of the preachers by turn at Hoxton Chapel, and his merits as a speaker were discovered about the same time. His son considers that his chief talent lay in this power: calls him by nature an orator, always able to divine what was suited to his audience, and to adapt himself to them; and quotes, with pardonable pride, the opinion of Lord Holland (it is not said on what occasion), that as a persuasive speaker, he was surpassed only by Charles James Fox and Lord Chancellor Plunkett.

But sermons under this system of preaching evidently become orations; and much light is thrown by this volume on the construction of sermons,—a much more elaborate process than the parochial system encourages amongst ourselves. It is assumed that a carefully prepared sermon is preached dozens of times; that the mode of delivery is a study; that the audience require, and even demand, an amount of weekly excitement: as, for example, Mr. James's congregation, when he was absent from home, would write to him, complaining of the 'supplies in his absence;' and he had to answer, that only 'a sinful fastidiousness' could object to such preachers as he had provided for them. One of the most notable of Mr. James's sermons was preached (1816) for the London Missionary Society at the Surrey Chapel, which, before Exeter Hall was opened, offered the most important and exciting arena for their orators. The place was full hours before the service began. All the leading preachers in London and the provinces occupied the front seat in the gallery.

'The sermon, which occupies fifty pages of the Collected Works, and lasted two hours, was not read, but delivered *memoriter*. The preacher's brother sat in the pulpit with the manuscript in his hand, prepared, if there was a moment's hesitation, to suggest the forgotten word; but, from first to last, the discourse was delivered exactly as it stood on the paper—not an epithet or a preposition was changed. At the close of the first hour, the preacher requested permission to pause for a few minutes, and the people sung a hymn. Such was the excite-

ment of the congregation, that during this temporary interruption of the discourse, oranges were thrown into the pulpit to refresh the exhausted orator. The hymn finished, he rose again, and recovering his strength, thundered on for another hour, and closed at last with a peroration, anticipating the homage of all created things to God and Christ.—Pp. 143, 144.

The congregation listened with enthusiastic admiration; the preachers in the front gallery, ‘at the more thrilling passages, murmured their applause;’ all but ‘John Elias, the great ‘Welsh preacher,’ who exclaimed at the end, ‘I believe the ‘cross was there, but it was so heaped up with flowers, I could ‘not see it.’ The editor owns there is some truth in the criticism, but at the time, the impression produced by the sermon, both on hearers and readers, ‘cannot,’ we are told, ‘be ‘reported now without appearing to be guilty of the wildest ‘exaggeration.’ In a year or two from this period, it became necessary to rebuild the Carr’s Lane Chapel, which was wholly inadequate to the demands upon it. An accident connected with the building shows the more general uses to which they put their meeting-houses.

‘Not long after it was opened, an incident occurred which might have been attended with very appalling circumstances, and which placed me for several hours in a very painful situation. At the annual meeting of the Missionary Society, the abandoned idols, which had lately been imported from the islands of the South Seas, were exhibited on the platform in front of the pulpit. As the clock gallery was the most favourable place to gain a view of them, this was crowded to excess. After the business had proceeded for about an hour and a half, I received a pencil note to this effect:—“By all means stop the clapping of hands and stamping of feet. The gallery shakes under us. I have already heard two distinct cracks.” This was signed by a young architect. Upon the receipt of this note, I was thrown into a most dreadful dilemma. If I gave the alarm, the mischief by the sudden rising and rush of the people would in all probability be done; and if I said nothing, and the gallery should fall, I should be blamed for knowing the state of the case and not giving notice of it. We did stop the clapping, and the business went on. For two hours was I kept in this agony of suspense and dread. Happily, the meeting ended without any accident. Upon examination, it was found that we had been preserved from an appalling catastrophe by an interposition of Providence, little less than miraculous; for the two middle beams that support the gallery were found cracked quite through.’ * * *

‘After the opening of the new place, things went on for many years in an even kind of prosperity. The chapel was filled, the church increased, and the sun of prosperity shone upon us with cloudless splendour.’—P. 160.

This means to express the large congregation, the increasing number of members who, from fifty at the time of his entering upon the charge, rose to more than a thousand, to the unbroken harmony between pastor and flock, and to the success of his preaching.

In all the notices of preaching from his own pen, we observe that his avowed aim is, not the edification, but the conversion

of his hearers—not, of course, that edification is not in the mind of every earnest man, but conversion is his text. It seems to be assumed that every hearer who is not a member 'is unconverted,' he writes to his young colleague, in a strain of encouragement. 'If there has not been splendid success of conversions, there has been general acceptance.' He speaks of another minister: 'I do believe, as far as preaching goes, he converts more souls than I do.' He is 'sorrowfully impressed' that the work of conversion goes on slowly in our churches. He speaks to a large and attentive mass of regular hearers, who are not converted—who know they are not, and who are to be brought to a certain open statement of convictions and change of feeling, after which they are safe. It is always assumed to be perfectly ascertainable who have gone through this change: though the confidence is not always derived, we must observe, from any peculiar sanctity of life; for Mr. James brings very home charges against those in whom he most relies. 'Stagnancy characterises our churches.' 'Our churches are, in my opinion, far from a sound and healthy religion,' and constant similar expressions. All persons making the required profession expect to be admitted to membership, and the pastor is to satisfy himself of its genuineness by certain tests—a very arduous responsibility; for here the singular admission is made that, once a member, there is little hope for further spiritual change.

'I know that it is dangerous to reject a young and timid Christian; but, on the other hand, admission to the church after profession is generally considered by the individual as a certificate of personal religion; and should they be still in an unconverted state, in that state they will, in all probability, die; so that a too ready admission of persons to the church is, in effect, to be accessory to their self-deception, and therefore to their destruction. Hence I have often felt perplexed; and though I have been more strict than many of my brethren, there are many, very many, whom I now wish I had rejected.'—P. 329.

and again,—

'"I have sometimes seen cases in which there has been great solicitude till a profession of religion was made, and then it ceased, and the mind relapsed into indifference, and reposed upon its profession in spiritual sloth."—P. 351.

The principle of always preaching with a view to conversion from a state of alienation, and of absolute security for those who have passed through a spiritual change, both constitute fundamental differences between sectarian and essentially church teaching; the Church assuming a germ that may grow, a spark that may yet shine in every hearer; though, undoubtedly, the subject of conversion is profitable to us all, and the need of conversion must be felt whenever man acknowledges the reign of sin and error in his heart. Powerful as Mr. James's preaching is deemed to have been, holding men's attention, inducing 'seasons

of solemnity,' constantly attracting new hearers, it is surely a comment on what we have been saying that the *young* were least interested and impressed by it. It is clear that there was something that did not hit their case, or adapt itself to their consciousness. The following passage from the chapter written by his son bears upon this:—

'I must also state, as necessary to the understanding of my father's character, that, though so amiable, tender, and loving, he was entirely deficient in sympathy for any feelings unless he himself had experienced them. He could not enter into joys and sorrows which he thought unreal, puerile, or unworthy. He could not understand seductions and temptations which had no power over him. He could not patiently listen to vain hopes and groundless fears which he had never himself known; and he never seemed to me to understand exactly the state of mind and soul produced by error, sin, doubt, or disbelief. He was accustomed to address men and women in masses with arguments which he knew ought to prevail with them, and he could not enter into each particular case, and adapt his reasoning to it. When he succeeded, it was by exhibiting fairly the gospel of God, itself suitable to all cases, and sufficient for all emergencies. He believed it himself, declared it in love and tenderness, and left it to act for itself; and each mind he addressed received it, and appropriated it for itself.

'Hence he was not generally appreciated by young persons, particularly not by educated young men, who needed and wished to have brought before them some special view of Divine truth adapted to their usual habits of thought and feeling; and this not being done, they felt that they were not understood by him, lost all interest in his conversation, and could not speak before him. It was, in fact, only matured and experienced Christians, with views and tastes in unison with his own, with whom he really had a fellow-feeling, and who, on their part, were at home with him. He preached often specially to the young, and such sermons were often very interesting, but not to the young more so than to grown-up people. The number of young persons who attended the chapel was very small in proportion to the congregation; and the young men in the church, unless in the lower ranks of the community, were very few. My father, at one particular period, noticed with dismay that no deacon had a son a member of the church.'—Pp. 574, 575.

We can understand that children, habituated to a strain which others hear with startling effect for the first time, must become callous to it. He evidently did not know how to get at them. We find him sending messages to the daughter of his American friend and brother, Dr. Patton. 'Give my love to Emily, and ask from me, if she has yet given her heart to Jesus. It is a solemn thing to outlive a revival without being converted.' And to the same young lady: 'Is Emily a Christian yet? Does she love Christ more than the world?' There is a pastoral epistle to a girl's school, written with a sincere anxiety for their good, but mistaken in the same way. 'He tells them impressions and convictions, that do not soon end in conversion, terminate in confusion and disappointment. I have known young persons who, though deeply impressed with pious subjects at school, have lost all their impressions at home,

'even though their parents were pious people.' By which we would gather that he found himself powerless with young people unless he could affect them in masses. And if girls were a difficulty, we need not wonder that he pronounces young men 'a class of persons in this country, and in our congregation, more hopeless than any other.'

For these and all other difficulties, the resource was, and in this system must be, excitement. Mr. James threw himself into revivals with a deliberate enthusiasm; he felt them necessary. He never seems to have entered into the difference between the American and the English character, and mourns over the insensibility of his country as compared to American impressibility and tendency to act in numbers, as though the differences were all against us. And yet it seems as though he were driven by his system rather than by feeling to this view, as though he must take up revivals to be logically consistent, for he was most candidly alive to their danger in the working. In the close communication he kept up with the American Congregationalists, he was informed of every movement; and we find first such notices as 'Of revivals, strictly so called, I am sorry to say we know nothing in this country. It is true that religion is, as I think, steadily advancing, but it is more in the way of silent, unmarked progress.' Soon after Dr. Patton comes to England as Mr. James's guest, preaches revivalism, and the subject is put forward amongst the dissenting ministry,—

'The subject of revivals still continues to occupy the public attention. The greater number of our ministers have preached upon it, and many have printed tracts, treatises, or sermons, copies of which I herewith send you. My expectations, I confess, are not sanguine as to the results. Our professors are so entangled with the world in various ways, that I do not look at present for any great increase of their spirituality of mind or their devotional habits. My chief hope rests upon the ministers, who will, I think, be stirred up to a greater devotedness to the duties of their office, and a more intense earnestness after the conversion of sinners.'—P. 253.

And we find him writing to have some difficulties explained—

'I must say, that I feel so deeply interested in the subject of revivals, that I am anxious to have every objection to them removed. The existence of our National Establishment is, in this country, a great impediment in the way of such a state of things here. I am quite convinced that, had not the Church of England been set up again at the Restoration, religion would have been in a far better state in the British empire than it is now.'—P. 251.

An effort was made, but it fell flat. A year after he writes (1829),—

'I am sorry to say that I think the stir about revivals begins to abate in this kingdom. We have taught, preached, printed, and prayed about it; but somehow or other it is, I fear, slipping from the public mind. I see no signs of an approaching awakening. I hear no rustling in the tops of the mulberry

trees indicative of the coming breeze. We do not seem prepared for the blessing. Our people are brimful of the world in most directions; if not of the love of the world, yet of the care of the world, and there is little room for the subject of revivals. My own church, I thank God, is in a tolerably flourishing state; yet I cannot speak of an awakening. We shall add to our fellowship this year perhaps about seventy members, which is certainly with us an unprecedented number. But the generality of our members appear to me to be in a state of much lukewarmness.—P. 257.

And again,—

‘Alas! for England, on the subject of revivals! No symptoms of an encouraging nature appear in our churches; no certain signs of renewed vigour; no unambiguous tokens of the descending shower are to be discerned. The little stir that was made about two years ago has nearly all died away; and though it has left in some few instances a happy result in renewed ministerial exertion, it has not been followed by any visible general result.’—P. 261.

He is ready to lay all the blame of this deadness on the Church of England, and is reverentially complimentary to the land so happily free from the evils of a religious establishment on all points except slavery, on which he delivers his testimony with a persistence which seems to have eventually alienated his brethren of the United States from him. Slavery first pressed itself on his mind in the light of a hindrance to the revivals.

‘I am the more solicitous about the matter in consequence of the revivals of religion with which your land has been visited and blessed. It is becoming more and more common for humane and even religious persons to meet our accounts of these gracious visitations with the taunt, “Let them learn humanity towards the blacks, and we shall then perhaps be inclined to think better of their religion.” This is sufficiently mortifying to one who has said so much about America as myself.’—P. 269.

But revivals had other drawbacks even in America. We find, in a letter to Dr. Sprague,—

‘Oh, what a time was it at Northampton under the ministry of your illustrious Jonathan Edwards! and yet there is a problem connected with that revival which I cannot solve. In five years after it took place, the hearts of the people were so turned against him as to account him their enemy, or at least to treat him as if he were so.’—Pp. 250, 251.

To which Dr. Sprague replies,—

“You suggest, in your letter, a difficulty respecting the revival at Northampton and Jonathan Edwards. I have not the means, at this moment, of referring to printed documents on the subject, but my impression is, that it admits of easy explanation. That that part of his congregation who passed through the revival without becoming Christians, should have been more restless than ever before, and less patient of his close and pungent dealing with the conscience, you will readily perceive was a natural consequence of their having been in a greater or less degree awakened under his preaching, and having resisted the Holy Spirit. I have myself often seen cases, during a revival, in which persons who have been regarded as models of everything that is amiable, and among the best specimens of human nature, have exhibited against the revival, and all who were active in promoting it, the venom of a viper. And there have been instances not a few, in which this has laid the

foundation, on the part of those who have not been converted, for a deep and incurable prejudice against the minister; he has been guilty of the sin of disturbing their consciences, and they cannot forgive it."—P. 252.

This we call an unsatisfactory solution, but probably the only acceptable one. The consequence, in Mr. James's own case, of this movement, or attempted movement, seems to have been the composition of his best known work, 'The Anxious Inquirer.' This little book, which has sold in hundreds of thousands, and been translated into many languages, was suggested after the meeting of a congress of ministers on the subject of conversion. It is not necessary to enter into its characteristics; of course it embodies his opinions; but the secret of its success beyond other works of the same school, lies in the fervour with which it was written, and the deep, serious study it demands and claims as its due. As a *tract*, it seems to us to stand on quite different grounds from the majority of these effusions. It was written for individuals, and with such in his eye; it opens with a very solemn exordium, insisting that it shall be read in solitude, with every circumstance of awful, impressed attention. He writes perfectly convinced that it is a critical moment with every reader whose eyes fall on his pages; he feels that he is setting down words of salvation with the fullest intensity of which he is capable. We quite believe there is no pretension or assumption of solemnity for a purpose in all this; it was the action of the revival movement (a failure elsewhere) on his own mind.

"Take the book with you," writes the author, "into your closet; I mean your place of retirement for prayer; for, of course, you have such a place. Prayer is the very soul of all religion, and privacy is the very life of prayer itself. This is a book to be read when you are alone; when none is near but God and your conscience; when you are not hindered by the presence of a fellow-creature from the utmost freedom of manner, thought, and feeling; when, unobserved by any human eye, you could lay down the book, and meditate, or weep, or fall upon your knees to pray, or give vent to your feelings in short and sudden petitions to God. I charge you, then, to reserve the volume for your private seasons of devotion and thoughtfulness; look not into it in company, except it be the company of a poor trembling and anxious inquirer, like yourself."—P. 290.

Contrast this tone with that of the ordinary tract, which may, in some parts, look very like it. The tract which is vaguely addressed to an unknown public, thrust by perfunctory hands into unwilling ones, only soliciting a passing attention, thankful for any sort of reading, without one evidence of real earnestness in any one concerned—writer, selector, distributor; what wonder, then, if not in the reader either? In another point also it differs from the ordinary popular treatise, that it addresses itself to those minds already occupied with Divine things. The words of the title are technical and recognized terms in sectarian

phraseology. 'I have began an anxious inquiry meeting,' writes Mr. James to his friend, previous to his particular appropriation of the expression in his book, and he only designs that such shall read it. Being thus real, the fruit of feeling rather than dogmatism, it is comparatively free from the repelling formalism and rigid system of many of this school in defining the Spirit's operations:—

'From Mr. James's Autobiography it appears that his own spiritual life had not passed through the precise chronological development, which some systematic writers on conversion have insisted upon. He had known the uncertainties and vicissitudes, the temporary victories and the subsequent defeats, the vacillation and inconstancy which most commonly mark the first efforts of the soul to forsake sin and live for God. In the almanac, winter melts into spring, spring brightens into summer, and summer ripens into golden autumn, by regular gradations. But the seasons are too wilful to obey the almanac: far on in spring, sometimes in the very heart of summer, we have cold winds and wintry snow; and often in March or April we are gladdened by days of warmth and sunshine that seemed to have missed their way, and to belong rather to July. It is just so in the rise and progress of religion in the soul; and it is one of the great excellencies of the "Anxious Inquirer," that it prescribes no exactly-defined experiences through which the mind must pass in order to arrive at rest in God. The reader is not distressed by the apprehension that perhaps in his case one link in the chain has a flaw in it, and that all the links that follow are therefore worthless. The endeavour to manufacture faith in Christ and love toward God, by an elaborate process of spiritual chemistry, is a most perilous mistake; and I repeat, that the "Anxious Inquirer" is free from the imputation of encouraging this delusion.'—P. 303.

In the various testimonies given by the biographer to the marvellous effects of this little work, it generally transpires that the mind of the recipient was predisposed to accept its teachings, and in a frame to be influenced and stimulated by it. The facts related are all expressed with the sharp definiteness of detail, and exactness as to numbers, which characterise sectarian statements on spiritual phenomena. In one case, 'twenty-seven persons were hopefully converted' by a single copy; in another, nine friends assembled together found that each had received from it 'needful guidance and stimulus, by which they had been led to trust in the Lord Jesus;' and at a public meeting, where the author was present, a Dutch minister told of twelve students for the ministry who, of his own knowledge, had been converted by it in the Dutch translation. Not only to Churchmen, but, probably, to all readers, its extreme popularity must be now a matter of some wonder. It operated on Mr. James himself, very naturally by impressing him with a deep sense of his own conspicuous place in the world, expressed not in a vain spirit, but still with an abiding force.

But from the first he had been sustained in a consistent career by that self-respect and self-assertion which belongs to some characters, and gives weight to all that they do by investing it

in their own eyes with importance. When we consider his origin and early life, it is wonderful how he assumed a standing even in youth. His first marriage helped this. He was thus independent of his congregation, who, on their part, probably had more satisfaction in endowing their pastor with a fair income than if he had been in circumstances to need it more. As far as we are told, he never allowed money to be a subject of difficulty with his flock. On one occasion he was invited to transfer himself to Manchester, with the offer of a thousand a-year from that congregation. Though at the time he was in the receipt of only 300*l.* at Birmingham, he was not tempted to leave his flock. His own means, indeed, must have been ample; but this fact relieves him from some suspicions which the history of both his marriages might fairly give rise to: the second is thus recorded:—

‘Three years after the death of his first wife, Mr. James married again. In his narrative of his second marriage, after a few introductory observations, he says,—

‘By God’s good providence I was directed to one in every way worthy to be the successor of my first wife, and this is saying much. The widow of Mr. Benjamin Neale, of St. Paul’s Churchyard, had been sought by many, but she was reserved for me. Her first husband was a man of distinguished worth; intelligent, yet modest and rather reserved; public spirited, yet meek and gentle. He was just emerging into public notice, and was likely to prove one of those to whom the present and future ages, and all the nations of the earth, will be indebted for those invaluable institutions which are doing so much for the conversion of the world to God. By one of the mysteries of Divine Providence, he was cut off by consumption at the age of thirty. His widow was left without family, and in the possession of property to the amount of about 20,000*l.* This was placed at her own disposal, with an understanding that so much of it as was mentioned by him, amounting to 5,000*l.* or 6,000*l.*, should at her death be devoted to religious institutions. Half of this sum she immediately paid over to various societies, reserving the other half to come after her decease. Instead of continuing housekeeping, Mrs. Neale, at the death of her husband’s mother, with whom she for a while resided, went into lodgings, that she might have a larger sum to dispense in works of general and religious charity. As a short memoir of this eminent Christian is in print, together with a funeral sermon preached by Dr. Redford of Worcester, and entitled “Faith Triumphant,” I shall not enlarge here upon her early history, nor her closing scenes. We were married by Rowland Hill, her particular friend, at Christ Church, Blackfriars, in London, February 19, 1822. She proved in every respect a helpmeet. Possessed of a masculine understanding, great public spirit, equal liberality, and eminently prudent, she was well fitted for the station into which Providence had now brought her. She had her failings; but they were very light and small compared with her many and eminent virtues.’—Pp. 161, 162.

And then follows on this unimpassioned narrative a few words of counsel to young ministers, coming with especial weight from so much happy experience:—

‘It has long been my opinion that the comparative failure of many of our ministers in their public career is owing to unsuitable marriages. They are in

haste to be married, and frequently make most unwise selections. Unhappily, some of them had formed juvenile engagements before they entered upon their studies, which they could not very honourably dissolve, though very much below them; while others have most incautiously allowed themselves to be entangled while at college. It is but rarely that a student makes a wise choice. The result is, a frivolous, weak, moneyless, thriftless woman becomes his wife—a young family comes on—difficulties increase—a small stipend, hardly sufficient to obtain necessities, is all they have to depend upon—the spirit of the husband and the pastor is broken, and he wears out life in moving from church to church, without being useful anywhere. He has had little leisure, and less disposition, surrounded as he has been with pecuniary embarrassments and domestic perplexities, to improve his mind and add to his stock of knowledge. What is the preventive of all this? Celibacy? By no means; but great care, deliberation, caution, and patience in the selection of a wife, united with much and earnest prayer to be guided aright.—P. 162.

This appreciation of money was no doubt more because a good income brought independence and position, than that it ministered to luxury or display. And both his wives furthered this appropriation of their wealth. They practised a grave and orderly hospitality, especially to students of the college, under Mr. James's visitorship, and to travelling ministers. Writing of his second wife to Dr. Sprague, he speaks of 'the excellent woman whom he had more than once seen presiding with grace, intelligence, and piety, over his domestic affairs.' But ordinary visiting was uncongenial to himself, and was discountenanced by his second wife as tending to worldliness, which it was her special mission to suppress. He speaks with contempt of evenings spent in listening to young ladies' efforts on the piano. Dinners he never went to; and, indeed, his life was so taken up with public and private professional engagements, and he saw such variety of people, that this, in fact, was his society. When popular ministers of any 'denomination' spend their lives in public,—courted, sought after, listened to with deference—it is easy for them to disparage amusement, and what is meant by relaxation. On this subject his son writes,—

'I have another remark to make which also may appear paradoxical, that, notwithstanding the amiability and tenderness which I have already referred to, and the geniality on which I shall shortly dwell, he was inclined to asceticism in his practice, and to austerity in his opinions. But his writings and his habits bear me out in this. The Puritans were so, and the spirit of the Puritans was in him. And, so far as my acquaintance with ecclesiastical biography extends, this has been the leaning (and it seems to me it must be so) of every eminent saint, whether among Protestants or in any of the old Episcopal communions either of the West or East. I know he contended that this was not the case with him, and deprecated inferences to that effect being drawn from his writings; but what he said showed that he was conscious of this tendency in all his opinions and practices. He seemed to me to have attained the character which, it is said, John Calvin, in his admiration for St. Bernard, wished to form in all his followers, that of a man who, while he played his part and did his duty in the world, should yet have his heart as

much in heaven as if he had been in a cloister. And this is the specific state of mind my father again and again exhorts to.

'I feel bound to state that these tendencies increased in him very much after the revivalist preachers from the States visited him, who (in contrast to his old friend Dr. Patton, who became more hearty and genial every time he came to us) seemed to set themselves against all enjoyment whatsoever. My stepmother so far fell in with these views as to wean my father from friendly visiting. And, with reference to this, my uncle James once said to me, "My brother would never have had the hold he has on his people if he had from the first pursued this system, and it will make us a rope of sand."—Pp. 575, 576.

'Friendly visiting' must always be a ministerial difficulty; but probably Mr. James would have admitted that he did not forego anything, and made no sacrifice, in renouncing the social gatherings of his congregation.

His son bears testimony to the consistent piety of his private life, to his affection and sense of duty in all the domestic relations. The people about him were attached to him. His biographer, Mr. Dale, who had known him for years, as a student, and afterwards as colleague or co-pastor, gives valuable testimony to qualities which have their peculiar exercise in such a connexion, often a trying one.

'In his heart of hearts, the aged minister loved and trusted his younger colleague—was his generous, unflinching champion against all suspicion and unjust censure—was ingenious in his devices to secure for him public respect and honour—was open and frank in the private discussion of questions on which they disagreed—never suggested, because he never supposed, that the authority of his own age, reputation, and experience could justify him in requiring the young minister to sacrifice or trifle with his convictions of truth or duty. In one word, Mr. James had a noble, generous temper, and in all his conduct towards me, there was never the faintest trace of suspicion or selfishness.'—P. 475.

His flock evidently desired more frequent visits from him. But this duty, 'shepherding' is the term used, never seems considered an indispensable one amongst Dissenters; and from what we read here, Mr. James must have recognised it in a much greater degree than his brethren, though he writes,—

"Perhaps I have erred in being too little with my people. This, however, is to err on the right side. No one could ever call me a gossiping minister. Many, I am persuaded, make themselves too familiar with their people in this way. A dignified reserve is better than a jocular familiarity. By these means I have, through God's blessing, I believe, maintained the respect as well as the affections of my people."—P. 468.

However, he is not always so satisfied on this point, and has a good deal on his conscience in the matter of 'facetiousness,' which in certain moods he makes vows absolutely to renounce, as though he felt it an habitual temptation. We can only say that his writing bears no trace of this lively and attractive infirmity.

If some 'members' complained to him that they had not seen him in the course of the year, he accepted it as a sign of prosperity, for had there been death or misfortune he would not have been so remiss. His whole course shows a clear determination to be as little dependent on his flock as possible, as he did, in fact, secure for himself, through *prestige* of character and easy circumstances, a standing analogous to that of a church dignitary. He never really tested the voluntary system. He exclaims on 'the beauty of the principles of the Congregational mode of church government,' but he never allowed them legitimate play. He possessed the art of government in his own person; always held the first place; boldly claimed that the pastor's voice shall be next to the New Testament; was supposed to rule his people with a rod of iron; and while he compliments his deacons very early in his career, he reminds them at the same time of their subordination, as when he says,—

"I am sorry to say, from an extensive survey of our independent churches, that deacons have not unfrequently been the torment of the minister, and the bane of the congregation. A mean and unworthy lust of power, a busy and meddling disposition, which loves to intrude into things beyond the line of its appropriate sphere, have multiplied in modern times the character of the Diotrephes of antiquity. It has ever been the happy lot of the church in Carr's Lane, and of its present minister, to be blessed with deacons who know how to support their office with dignity, without pride—with authority, without usurpation—with activity, without officiousness."—P. 135.

For more than fifty years he continued their minister, always holding his own and carrying his points. One element of division he was very careful to avoid, for the female members—an exception, as it appears, to the general rule—had no votes in the Carr's Lane meeting. To predominate for fifty years over a thousand people, to be a ruler all that time, implies real power and, probably, considerable strain. He had infirmities which show this—singular nervous impressions and fancies, which withheld him from the ordinary itinerant labours of a popular preacher's life for twenty years. He could not sleep in the interval between a promise to preach away from home and its fulfilment, and he was even haunted by whimsical fear, amounting to mania, as by the dread, if he trusted himself among strangers, of being put into a room from whence there was no escape in case of fire. It is wonderful, with these symptoms of a brain overwrought, that he could pursue his ordinary routine with such steady, laborious propriety. There is throughout a singular mixture of practical good sense and judgment, and a love and faith in excitement, and in every crude scheme for reviving spirituality and carrying out great religious effects. We have seen how he caught at Revivals. He was warm for the temper-

ance movement, discontinued the use of wine in his own person and at his table, and writes,—

“For the sake of the world, my dear sir, and all future generations of mankind, I beseech you to go on in this splendid course of national virtue. I have patriotism enough to wish this laurel had been plucked by my own country; but since this is not granted to *us*, I rejoice that it is *yours*. It is a precious one. Preserve it from fading by a relaxation of zeal in the cause, and deem not the honour complete till the world shall talk of the United States as a land without a still, and without a drinker of ardent spirits. If you ever arrive at this elevation of moral greatness, your example *must* and *will* be felt in the world.”—Pp. 512, 513.

Words like these might appear impossible from the pen of a sensible man. Living in Birmingham later in life he had to drink wine, and his son writes:—

‘He was always so abstemious that it was no matter of self-denial to him to give up drinking wine, but according to the opinions of all his medical advisers he injured his constitution by doing so. He felt, however, so strongly on the matter, as an advocate of the Temperance Society, that when compelled to take it temporarily he always left it off too soon. But his taking wine, even under these circumstances, was, at least on one occasion, noticed in an abstinence journal in language appropriate to the relapse of a reclaimed drunkard.’—P. 579.

He was zealous for the missionary cause, and especially for the conversion of China; Morrison, a name well-known among missionaries, having been his college friend. On occasion of the Chinese rebellion, 1852-53, a friend conceived and he put in practice the strange idea of sending a million New Testaments to China, to assist and inform the dawning faith of the rebels. He did not propose that missionaries should *accompany* the Testaments to account for them and explain them. They were to do their work, as a shower fructifies the place where it falls, without any human agency. They were to appear in China, and to convert it. His friend wished this mission by books to be the work of the Sunday Schools of England. Mr. James wished the Bible Society, ‘as representing the Catholic Church,’ (constituting the scheme a small temporary Bible Society for China,) to contribute, and he carried the day. A long address from his pen appeared in the *British Banner*, where, after pressing the duty on all denominations of sending out missionaries, but pointing out the impossibility of united action, he continues—

“Is there nothing to be done at this juncture by the union and co-operation of all at home and all abroad for the conversion of China to the pure faith of the Gospel of Christ? I say, for the pure faith of the Gospel of Christ. For it is evident that though the new faith of this body comprehends the *elements* of Christianity, it is, for want of the New Testament, in an imperfect and corrupted form. What they want is, the *Christian* Scriptures. They know more of the Old Testament than of the New. Protestants, now give your serious attention to what follows. I have lately received a letter from that

active and devoted friend of Christian enterprise, Thomas Thompson, Esq. of Poundsford Park, containing the noble proposal to *raise a fund immediately for printing and circulating in China* a million copies of the Chinese New Testament, and earnestly soliciting me to lay the subject before the public, through the medium of the Press, and to call out the Sunday-school teachers and scholars to do the work. The project of circulating a million copies of the New Testament is itself a vast idea. Is it practicable? Easily. Is it worth the effort, the pains, and the cost? Transcending all we can calculate. Shall it be done? Will not voices as numerous, though far more intelligent, as those which, in the eleventh century, under the wild enthusiasm of Peter the Hermit, shook the plains of Clermont, and raised the thundering shout, 'God wills it!' again say, 'God wills it'? What might not a million copies of the New Testament, poured into China at such a time as this, accomplish for the cause of Christianity, in correcting the false notions of the insurgent leaders, of the nature of our holy religion, and in circulating a pure Christianity among their followers? Unhappily, Christianity is now presented mixed up with fables, and associated with fanaticism, war, and massacre. It is infinitely important that we should lose no time in presenting it pure and uncorrupted in its own inspired records."—Pp. 432, 433.

The scheme was taken up according to both proposals with great zeal. The Sunday schools, the Bible Society, and the denominations sent out, not one million, but two, or rather 'between two and three millions of Testaments.' Many ardent letters are inserted, many instances of youthful enthusiasm in the contributors and promoters of the movement. On this ground the editor ventures to call it a *successful* movement; but so far as concerns the object for which so much excitement was raised, we can only assume it an utter failure. As how could it be otherwise? Mr. Dale is obliged to enter into this part of the subject, and gives an extract to prove that some of the Testaments were distributed in China, and civilly received. He gives us no direct evidence that even one of them was read. He is therefore obliged to look for indirect fruits, as that the stir made in collecting the money for the Testaments is likely, he thinks, to create a deep and general interest in missions to China. We, on the contrary, believe that mistaken efforts, resulting in failure, are likely to produce apathy and disbelief in future endeavours. The little children who gave their pence under such magnificent promises, of which they hear no fulfilment, cannot be so easily roused again. They will look back on their previous feelings as a temporary excitement which ended in nothing, and perhaps take it as a precedent or a warning. We read, however,—

'It would be a mistake to estimate the importance of this unique and successful movement merely by the money which was contributed, or even by the vast number of Testaments which it has placed at the disposal of Chinese missionaries and colporteurs. Mr. James's proposal created a deep and general interest in missions to China, out of which may some day arise efforts to evangelise that country of a far grander magnitude than Protestant churches

have ever yet attempted. Just as the Testaments were beginning to be distributed, events occurred which for a time disturbed missionary operations.'...

'The recent interruption of friendly relations between China and western Europe has again checked our missionary exertions; but the hope may be justly cherished, that whenever the people of that great empire shall be accessible to the influences of Christian teaching, Chinese missions will be supported with an enthusiasm and a generosity which shall demonstrate that Mr. James did not write and speak and pray in vain.'—Pp. 446, 448.

We believe Mr. James really felt the isolation of a sect. All these efforts for united action are proofs of a yearning for something which Congregationalism did not give. He got into contests with the Church, frequently expressed himself bitterly towards it, but had all the while a respect for the piety which, strange to say, still lingered round so 'hopelessly corrupt' an organization, and had an evident longing for its good will. He thought himself driven, as a 'thorough-going Voluntary believing' that Establishments necessarily annihilate the distinction 'between the Church and the world, and render good men less 'useful than they would have been under other circumstances,' to oppose it, but pathetically complained of the consequences of his attacks. 'If a man writes against the Church, no matter 'on what compulsion, or in what spirit or manner, he is denounced throughout the kingdom.' And he frequently alludes to the grievance of the richer members of his congregation lapsing to the Church—a secession sure to be peculiarly distasteful to him. He was always contriving schemes for doing away 'minor differences,' and bringing men to act in any way together; and expresses a particular elation and gratitude when any of our clergy entered into them. We have said he originated the Evangelical Alliance, of which his autobiography contains the following notice:—

'No thoughtful Christian can be otherwise than afflicted by the multiplied sects, divisions, strifes, and controversies of Christendom. Strange and mournful it is that the prayer of our Lord for the visible unity of His people should not yet have been answered in any tolerable measure. I do not think that professing Christians are sufficiently impressed and afflicted by this state of things. They are not only reconciled to it, but often compare it to the varied colours of the rainbow, adding, by variety, to the beauty of the Church. This is a fatal mistake. It is disfigurement, not loveliness, that is much to be deplored, and we ought to do all we can to remove it. All cannot be right. There must be much error afloat in these diversities. I have often reflected upon these things. One morning, at my private devotions, I was much led out in prayer on this subject, and a suggestion came forcibly to my mind to do something to effect a union of Christians in some visible bond. I rose from my knees and sketched out a rough draft of a scheme of union. The May meeting of the Congregational Union soon followed. At that meeting I called the attention of the brethren present to the subject before them. Indeed, this was my chief object in going to the meeting.'—P. 397.

And he pursued the idea under the notion of having discovered the secret of real union, and turned the tables, so to say, on the Church. This, again, is a specimen of his eager faith in new schemes:—

“Conceive what an impression would be produced upon the public mind, by such a scene as Exeter Hall would present in this holy fellowship of brethren—the long lost wonder of a united church would be restored, the echoes of the ancient exclamation would be awakened, and thousands of voices would again be heard to say, ‘See how these Christians love one another!’ What a rebuke and refutation, I repeat, would it give to the proud isolation of Puseyism. The public, when they saw this arrogant and malignant spirit retiring within the schools of Oxford, to adopt the ceremonial, and imbibe the intolerance and maledictory exclusiveness of its Roman master, would place in striking and beautiful contrast with it, the brightening and extending charity of other denominations, and in seeing them all come forth to such a noble fellowship of love, would be at no loss to determine who were in possession of the true catholicity.”—P. 403.

The evangelical alliance of practice against theory has long been before the world, and we cannot therefore pursue its history further, except to observe that it does not seem to have satisfied its founder. He complains that its seed fell among thorns—‘the thorns of religious controversy;’ though at first they had found no difficulty in establishing a basis of doctrine in which twenty different sects professed to be able to agree. This reliance on excitement, this search after new schemes, as the only defence against apathy and declension, is not, we think, a feature of individual character, but the recognition, by a clear-headed man, of the inevitable needs of his system. In his private religion he manifests very little of this temper. He never professes any height of rapture, sudden emotions, or startling changes; nor does he ever assume a state of feeling, because, according to a system, it ought to be there. He does not really care to write much about himself, and owns to some indistinctness of memory in his notices of his past history. His long period of popularity, and influence with his party, do not seem to have spoiled him. He kept a real watch over himself, and was on his guard against the temptations of his position. It is something for a successful preacher to be diffident of publishing his sermons; to be uneasy at notes being taken, lest any subsequent use should be made of them. He knew, and would not be persuaded out of the knowledge, that his power lay not so much in the composition as in the utterance; and we find him unconsciously arranging the order of a preacher's gifts for his calling, according to this conviction. *Voice and manner* came before talent and piety; and he was so much in the habit of insisting on the importance of manner, that many people ‘supposed that all his power lay in voice, tones, and gesture.’ These

seem, in reality, to have been very effective, at least, upon his particular class of hearers, though we cannot suppose they would have always pleased a refined taste, nor was he really satisfied with the results of his preaching; he seems always to have felt that something was wanting; a certain meagreness and insufficiency may have pressed upon him, though his was not a mind independent enough in its workings to detect the causes of certain unsatisfied desires. He had no sympathy with doubts and difficulties, and never understood them. He accepted from the first his place as 'Congregational pædo-Baptist,' as much without a question as though he had really lived in an age of unbroken, visible unity. We shall not find a more favourable example and specimen of Dissent than he presents in his own personal character and steady course from this very absence of the real schismatical element, and loyalty to the system in which he was born: while we cannot but feel how much that character would have gained in elevation, true wisdom, and utility, had it been permitted to form and expand under the deep truths, higher teaching, and nobler influences of the Church.

ART. V.—*The Pilgrim: A Dialogue on the Life and Actions of King Henry the Eighth.* By WILLIAM THOMAS, Clerk of the Council to Edward VI. Edited, with Notes from the Archives at Paris and Brussels, by J. A. FROUDE, Author of the 'History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.' London: Parker, Son, and Bourn, West Strand. 1861.

THE volume whose title appears at the head of this article may be regarded as a sequel to the first two volumes of the 'History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.' Mr. Froude, in his preface, very justly observes, that the outward events of the reign of Henry the Eighth are patent and acknowledged, and he appears, in the publication of the present volume, to have had it in view to offer a contribution towards the settlement of the question as to the causes in which those events originated. The Statute-book, he somewhat inaccurately remarks, gives one account of those causes; popular tradition gives another. It would have been nearer the truth if he had asserted that the Statute-book, as represented in the first two volumes of his history, gives an account of those transactions which run counter to the received opinion of the present day, which has a pedigree reaching to the period when the events took place. The sentence which follows, we presume, contains the true explanation of the publication of the 'Pilgrim'; 'The opinion of a contemporary English gentleman, who had no object to gain by dishonest advocacy, cannot but contribute something towards a just decision between the two authorities.' The truth of the statement is absolutely unexceptionable. The proposition is in itself none the worse for approximating to a truism. It is, as it were, the major premise of the volume before us. The volume itself is the minor premise, and contains the tacit assumption which vitiates the argument. If William Thomas was a contemporary English gentleman who had nothing to gain in the reign of Edward VI. by defending the acts and opinions of Henry VIII., his testimony is most valuable. Mr. Froude seems to have been in entire ignorance both of William Thomas and his work when he composed the earlier volumes of his history. Whether or not he has taken the trouble to inquire into his character, or whether his information concerning the writer extends no further than the facts which can be gathered from the work itself, we will not take upon us to determine; but as it is important towards forming a tolerably accurate judgment of the value of the work

that the reader should know something of the character of the writer, we will commence with giving a short account of Mr. William Thomas, author of the 'Pilgrim.' And we shall offer no apology for supposing our readers as ignorant on the point as Mr. Froude professes himself to have been when he penned his first two volumes.

All that can now be known of William Thomas is to be gathered from the account of him given by Anthony Wood in the 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' under the year 1554. He has the advantage of appearing in this respectable company not because he was educated at Oxford, but because another person of the same Christian and surname took the degree of B.C.L. at that university in 1529. He was a 'Welshman born, or at least of 'Welsh extract, and was educated in all kinds of learning fit for 'a gentleman.' He was probably, therefore, born and bred a gentleman; but nothing is known of him further till the year 1544, ten years before he died, when some misfortune, not specified by his biographer, obliged him to quit his native place, and was the occasion of his residence at Bologna at the commencement of the year 1547, when the news of the death of Henry and the accession of Edward arrived there. Here, being in the company of several gentlemen, he entered into discourse in defence of the said King, whose honour there had been wrongfully treated.

The discourse was afterwards drawn up, apparently, with a view to publication. The author appears to have lived in Italy till the beginning of 1549, and after his return to England was made Clerk of the Council to King Edward VI. (April 19, 1549). Wood attributes his appointment to the proficiency in modern languages, which he had acquired during his residence on the continent, and adds, that, as a reward for his attendance upon the council, he was presented by the king to the parsonage of Presteign, in South Wales, and a prebendal stall in Canterbury. It must be remembered that William Thomas never either was or professed to be in holy orders, nevertheless he enjoyed the profits of both these pieces of preferment till the accession of Mary. William Thomas may undoubtedly have been a Protestant on principle, but his Protestantism was at least profitable, and brought him in a sinecure income of what would now be estimated at some 3,000*l.* a year. The rectory of Presteign is still valued at about 1,300*l.* a year, as may be seen by reference to that useful annual, the *Clergy List*, and the prebendal stall was even at that time valued at '34*l.* and better' in the King's books. Even Protestant historians can scarcely reconcile themselves to the rapacity of the Clerk of the Council, and perhaps Strype felt the disposal of Church preferment to a mere layman

the more keenly, because he was himself so slenderly provided for in the Church. However, not to take Strype's account, we will refer to the original authority for this business about the prebendal stall.

It appears from a letter of Ridley's to Master Cheke, dated from Fulham, July 23d, 1551, that he wanted to confer the vacant stall upon one of three diligent preachers, two of whom are named—Bradford and Grindal. The latter, it appears, was the favourite, and Ridley was anxious to present him to it, in order to have him constantly in his diocese to preach. It is evident from Bishop Ridley's mode of writing that he had no very high opinion of William Thomas. His words are:—

'But alas, Sir, I am letted by the means (I fear me) of such as do not fear God. One Master William Thomas, one of the clerks to the Council, hath in times past set the Council upon me to have me to grant that Layton (the then possessor of the stall) might have alienated the said prebend unto him and his heirs for ever. God was mine aid and defender, that I did not consent unto his ungodly enterprize. Yet I was so then handled before the Council that I granted, that whenever it should fall, I should not give it before I should make the King's Majesty privy unto it, and of acknowledge before the collation of it. Now Layton is departed, and the prebend is fallen, and certain of the Council (no doubt by this ungodly man's means) have written unto me to stay the collation. And whereas, he despaireth that ever I would assent that a preacher's living should be bestowed on him, he hath procured letters unto me, subscribed with certain of the Council's hands, that now the King's Majesty hath determined it unto the furniture of his highness's stable. Alas, Sir, this is a heavy hearing. When papistry was taught there was nothing too little for the teachers. When the bishop gave his benefices unto idiots, unlearned, ungodly, for kindred, for pleasure, for service, and other worldly respects, all was then well allowed. Now, when a poor living is to be given unto an excellent clerk, a man known and tried to have both discretion and also virtue, and such a one as before God I do not know a man yet unplaced and unprovided for, more meet to set forth God's word in all England; when a poor living, I say, which is founded for a preacher is to be given unto such a man, that then an ungodly person shall procure in this sort, letters to stop and let the same, alas, Master Cheke, this seemeth unto me to be a right heavy hearing.'

The letter continues:

'And besides all this, I have a better opinion of the King's Majesty's honourable Council than, (although some of them have subscribed at this their clerk's crafty and ungodly suit, to such a letter,) than I say they will let and not suffer, after request made unto them, the living appointed and founded for a preacher to be bestowed upon so honest and well-learned a man.'

And that is our first instalment towards an estimate of the character of this English gentleman. Ridley was quite a pattern of meekness and gentleness, and is not very likely to have used so unsparingly the epithets 'crafty and ungodly' without good reason.

We proceed to the only other remaining incident in his life

that bears upon the subject. After the King's death it appears that Thomas incurred the displeasure of Queen Mary, and was deprived both of his place, and of all hopes of other preferment, lay or clerical. 'He hereupon,' we are now quoting Anthony Wood, 'designed her murder.' Wharton accuses him of devising the death of Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. Whatever was the accusation, certain it is that he was sent prisoner to the tower of London, February 20, 1553, together with Winter and Throckmorton. On the 26th of the same month, 'being,' says Wood, 'much conscious to himself that he should suffer a shameful death, he endeavoured to make away with himself by thrusting a knife into his body under his paps; but the wound did not prove mortal. On the 9th of May, 1554, he was arraigned and condemned at the Guildhall in London, and on the 18th of the same month was executed at Tyburn.' Wood sums up his character as follows:—'He was a man of hot fiery spirit, had sucked in damnable principles by his frequent conversation with Christopher Goodman, that violent enemy to the rule of women, and one of more misguided zeal than true religion and wisdom.' 'He suffered death at Tyburn before mentioned, by hanging, drawing, and quartering, leaving then behind him the character, by some, of a person of good parts. What became of his quarters I know not.'

So much for the character of the witness. It may, perhaps, throw a shadow of suspicion on the value of his testimony. Still, it does not follow that the testimony is false. A suspicious witness may give valuable evidence in support of any case, if it is confirmatory of other testimony, and that especially if he has no bias in favour of the side for which he is summoned. Let us turn to the catalogue of William Thomas's works to see if they will supply any light upon the subject. He seems to have produced very little that was printed and published; but several of his writings have been preserved amongst the Cotton MSS. in the British Museum. In a well-known article, containing the Depositions in the cause of Henry the Eighth's divorce from queen Catharine, there is an account of William Thomas's evidence, from which it will appear that he had early attached himself to the winning side, and that he did not swerve from it, at least while the Protestant party were in the ascendant. And now the reader will be able to judge how much reliance is to be placed on the facts which rest on no other evidence than their being stated in the '*Pelegrino Inglese*.' Of the actual contents of the volume, both as regards fact and argument, we shall have something to say presently. But before we begin, we must be allowed to profess our astonishment at the ignorance to which Mr. Froude pleads guilty. We have before now, in the *Christian*

Remembrancer, exposed the reckless disregard or ignorance of State Papers and published documents, which was evidenced in Mr. Froude's earlier volumes. Had he paid common attention to the printed papers which were in existence before the publication of his first two volumes, he would have been saved from many a mistake; neither is it credible that with an entire acquaintance with all that can be produced, he could have undertaken the monstrous task of defending the character of Henry VIII. But this by the way. We are at present only concerned with the amount of notoriety gained by William Thomas. It is true he is described by Bishop Ridley, his contemporary during the reign of Edward VI., as one William Thomas; but he has certainly earned his claim to rank as an historical personage, by his subsequent career during the reign of Queen Mary. It would be almost incredible, if Mr. Froude had not stated the fact himself, that he was not aware of the existence of this volume, and should speak of a defence of Henry VIII. written after his death by a clerk of the Privy Council, of which he knew no more than it was mentioned by Strype, as if it were a thing wholly, or almost wholly unknown. Even now he has taken so little trouble to investigate the matter, that he appears to know no more about it than that there is a copy among the Harleian MSS. which he accidentally met with, and another in the Lansdowne collection, and that it was printed in the last century, with a number of other tracts written by the same author. Mr. Froude appears to have extracted from Anthony Wood's '*Athenæ Oxonienses*' what he has learned of the author of the tract. If he had consulted Dr. Bliss's edition of the '*Athenæ*,' he would have learned a great deal more than he appears to know. Who would have thought from Mr. Froude's description that this unknown and obscure clerk of the closet is mentioned in nearly every book on the history of the times which contains any references to original authorities? Burnet and Strype are not so very uncommon books. Several pages of the latter are devoted to giving an account of the author, and some of Burnet's vilest falsehoods are extracted from the '*Pilgrim*.' He is alluded to again and again in, at least, three of the recent publications of the Camden Society, and his works in MS. exist in three different volumes of the Cotton Library. A writer of the '*History of England from the fall of Wolsey to the death of Elizabeth*,' might, indeed, be pardoned for not happening to know the edition of the collected works of William Thomas, published in 1767, but it is quite a scandalous instance of neglect to have omitted to read the original documents in Strype's '*Ecclesiastical Memorials*,' amongst which are several of the papers of William Thomas, printed at length.

Although we do not attach much weight to the author's authority, yet as a literary production the work was, perhaps, worth reprinting. We have already alleged enough to prove, that as far as any evidence it may produce as to the character of Henry VIII., it is probably without value, because its conclusions are unsupported by other evidence, and the character of the writer is not such as to entitle him to our belief. It would have been very desirable if the editor had added notes at the foot of the page, to enable the reader to distinguish between the true and the false, the credible and the incredible; yet with the exception of a brief note on the first page, contradicting a false statement about Henry having left a legacy to Aretino, to whom the book is dedicated, there is no attempt to correct the numerous errors into which the writer has fallen. The editor admits that it is not free from mistakes; but in spite of the inaccuracies, which might reasonably have been expected in a history written from memory, he claims for it the value of representing the impression generally current in the country, the popular view of the conduct and character of Henry VIII. as received in England at the time of his death.

The dialogue is alleged to have taken place at the house of a wealthy merchant at Bologna. After some preliminary talk on the nature of the climate and country of England, the conversation turned to the subject of the tyrannical reign of Henry VIII. just then brought to a termination; and one of the company undertook to prove the late King to have been a tyrant, on the ground that the principal token of a tyrant is the immoderate satisfaction of an unlawful appetite, when the person, whether by right or wrong, hath power to achieve his sensual will, and that the person, also, who by force draweth unto him that which of right is not his, in the unlawful usurping committeth express tyranny.

The indictment laid is a heavy one, and consists of fourteen counts very systematically drawn up, and extending over above three pages of the volume, the remaining sixty or seventy being taken up by the defence. We need not transcribe them. We must suppose our readers fairly acquainted with the history of this period, and must refer them to Lingard or Hume, Sharon Turner or Tytler, as their respective prejudices or conclusions may incline them. The chief points alleged are, that the King cast off his lawful wife, the Emperor's aunt, after he had lived with her for eighteen years, and abolished the authority of the Roman see, because Clement VII. refused to justify the divorce, taking upon himself the papal title and authority; that he beheaded Bishop Fisher, of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, because they would not be a party to such abominations; that

he overthrew the monasteries for the sake of their wealth, which he appropriated; that he broke his promise of pardon to the rebels of the North, and 'caused a number of the most noble of them to be put to death by divers torments.' The ninth accusation, which is the most difficult to answer, we will give in the author's own words:—

'And not his first wife, but three or four more, did he not chop, change, and behead them, as his horse coveted new pasture, to satisfy the inordinate appetite of his lecherous will? Two of his wives he hath caused to suffer death, and two remain yet alive.'

And lastly is added the persecution of Cardinal Pole, the murder of Pole's mother and brother, and the beheading of the Duke of Norfolk and his son. Before we go on to notice the rejoinder it is worth observing, that, to say the least of it, a contemporary defence implies a contemporary attack, so that Mr. Froude could scarcely claim this work, even were William Thomas's defence ever so conclusive and satisfactory, as the representation of the popular view of Henry VIII.'s character and conduct, received at the time of his death.

However, such is the accusation, which at least has no novelty in it. The defence consists of a vast number of statements made by the author, but very little argument that we have been able to detect. There is, moreover, one passage in the accusation which tells rather heavily against an observation made by the editor, in his preface. Mr. Froude seems to think it is ridiculous explanation, when the cowardice and servility of lords and commons are alleged as the account of Henry's tyrannical proceedings being allowed to go unquestioned. He says, 'the House of Commons need but have adjourned in a body from Westminster to Whitehall to have made the king their prisoner.' Yet this was the view of things actually taken by the person with whom William Thomas held this real or imaginary dialogue. He finishes the harangue, in which he enumerates the king's delinquencies with the observation, that 'not only his general proceedings, but also every particular and private part thereof was better known in Italy than in his own dominions, where, for fear, no man durst either speak or wink.'

The answer to the first accusation of the unlawfulness of the divorce, very easily settles all the intricate questions that arose, avoiding some and cutting the knot of others by the most barefaced assertions. Thus, the alleged virginity of Catharine is disposed of as unimportant, the author taking care to insinuate, that the issue of that marriage was that gentle lady, Mary, whose beauty and virtue you have most worthily commended. But, from all that appears in this narrative, the reader would

judge that the papal legate, Campeggio, who had been sent to try the cause, had decided the matter for the divorce. The whole statement of the case occupies exactly two octavo pages; but brevity can afford no excuse for beginning a sentence with saying that a legate *a latere* was sent to determine the cause, and ending it with the assertion, that after the matter had been long disputed, the error of the Pope's dispensation, for the marriage of Catharine and Arthur, was discovered, and his Majesty divorced from the same Lady Catharine. Who would have thought from such a description what was the true state of the case, that Henry, after having for years vainly attempted to extort a decision of his cause from Clement VII., had taken it out of his hands, had one of his own creatures consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, for the express purpose of deciding the case in his favour, and had had it so decided some six months after he had been cohabiting with Anne Boleyn, and just three months before the birth of Elizabeth?

These two pages may be taken as a specimen of the value of William Thomas's book in an historical point of view. As a literary curiosity, we confess we are glad the book has been made accessible to English readers; and Mr. Froude must be allowed the merit of having proved that he is not absolutely singular in his estimate of the character of Henry the Eighth.

We have said that Mr. Froude has not taken the trouble to add notes corrective of the mistakes of his author; but more than half the volume is occupied by a series of notes giving a running commentary upon the text, and which may be spoken of as endorsing it in the main and supplying additional information on points which are briefly treated. The first of these notes occurs at page 18, at the conclusion of the two pages of defence of the King for the divorce from Catharine of Arragon. It might have been expected that so flagrant a violation of truth, as is implied in the defence, would have been at least cursorily noticed; but Mr. Froude seems to think, that if a thing did not take place in history, it ought to have taken place, and, without appearing to agree exactly with his author, treats his statement as a rough approximation to the truth, near enough for all ordinary readers. This note, which contains some valuable State Papers, which now see the light for the first time, is headed with the following piece of information:—

'Judgment was never pronounced in the Legate's Court; but the case arrived at a point when the sentence, if sentence were given, could only be in the king's favour, and the Emperor, to protect Catharine, was obliged to insist on the avocation of the suit to Rome.' The following letters add something to our

knowledge of the influences which were at work below the surface. Mendoza was a secret agent of Charles the Fifth, in England. De Praet, who became afterwards celebrated, was minister at Rome. The two letters which follow do not add much light to the history of the period; but they are interesting, as showing how entirely conversant Charles was kept as to all that transpired in England and at Rome, in regard to the divorce.

The extirpation of the Papal authority in England is the next count in the indictment, and the defence here occupies no less than ten pages. The writer finds it convenient to treat of the two counts as distinct. The accusation indeed connects the two, inasmuch as the opponent distinctly charges the king with annulling the authority of the Roman Church, in order to accomplish his will in the new marriage of his second wife, which Clement VII. refused to consent to. It was convenient to treat the abolition of the Papal authority separately, and not to confound it with that which was indirectly its cause. And here occurs the vilest lie of which Mr. William Thomas was guilty. He tells us, that the beginning of the abolition came from a suggestion of the Duke of Suffolk's, who asked his Majesty 'how this matter might come to pass, that a Prince, in his own realm, should so humble himself before the feet of a vile, strange vicious priest (for Campeggio there in England demeaned himself in very deed most carnally, in hunting of whores, playing at dice and cards, and sundry such other cardinal exercises),' whereto the king answered he could not tell, but only that it seemed unto him that spiritual men ought to judge spiritual matters. 'And yet as you say,' said the king, 'meseemeth there should be somewhat in it; and I could right gladly understand why and how, were it not that I would be loth to appear more curious than other princes.' 'Why, sir,' said the duke, 'your majesty may cause the matter to be discussed by your learned men without any rumour at all.' And thus 'inspired by God, he called divers of his great and trusty doctors unto him, charging them distinctly to examine what law of God should direct so carnal a man as Campeggio, under the name of spiritual, to judge a king in his own realm,' &c. We have quoted this passage at length, not for the purpose of examining how much of argument and how much of fallacy it contains, nor how it bears upon the cause, but merely to notice the fact upon which so much stress is laid. Now, the whole of this accusation against Campeggio is false. The only colour, or foundation in fact, that it has is this, that Campeggio when he came into England brought one of his sons with him. A contemporary historian, probably thinking the matter notorious enough, forgot to explain

how a cardinal could have a son born in lawful wedlock. The solution of the difficulty is simply this; that the cardinal was a widower before he was admitted to holy orders at all, and, from the single fact that he had children, William Thomas has trumped up the story, that an old cardinal of seventy years of age, who suffered so dreadfully from the gout that he was obliged always to be carried about in a litter, spent his time when he arrived in England as Papal legate, in all kinds of debauchery. If this is not a wilful lie it argues the grossest ignorance on the part of the writer as to the transactions in England fifteen years before the period at which he writes. Let the reader adopt which part of the alternative he pleases, either will supply the means of estimating the historical value of the rest of the narrative.

As to the argument by which the king is defended in his separation from the Church of Rome, it is nothing more than the common argument, which, whatever be its value, need not be here discussed. The doctors who are said to have settled the question, began by taking the Gospel for their absolute rule, and then easily discovered that no Scripture proof could be brought for the Pope's authority over kings and emperors; and the argument is represented as having the cogency of an *à fortiori* by representing that Peter, Paul, Solomon, and Christ Himself, commanded obedience to heathen kings; how much more is it due to a virtuous Christian king, that he should not be expected to appear on his trial before a vile, vicious beast, grown out of the dunghill, like Campeggio.

As a specimen of the mixture of argument and ribaldry, the following passage will serve:—

'Christ having bolted the gates of Heaven, and barred the doors on the inward side, bade Peter keep those keys safe until the day of judgment. Before that time He would not that men should corporally enter in there by the gate, but fly in spirit over the wall. So that Peter, all the days of his life, sought to lead all true Christians by lively faith as his Master taught him, and not by opening the gates: and therefore hid the keys in his habitation at Antioch, where they lay many years unknown. At length, in the time of Phocas the Emperor of Constantinople, a simple priest found them, and marvelling at the curious workmanship (being as they were of divine operation), to gratify his lord the emperor with so rare a thing, went and presented them to his majesty, who, not knowing how to use them, gave them after unto Pockyface (I should say Boniface the Third), by whom they were first brought into the Roman Church. But in effect this Boniface, seeking the gates of heaven, failed of his way, and by misfortune happened on the gates of hell, where, unwittingly, he put those keys in use, and in very deed at once opened them; *quia portæ inferni non prævalerunt adversus eum*, in such wise that the devils got out and by plain force, after they had drawn Boniface in, kept the gates so wide open that all they who have followed Boniface in the Papistical belief thinking to climb to heaven, are fallen there by the way. Finally, to conclude of this Popish authority: It was not only found that the Pope was a false prophet, a deceiver and beguiler of human souls, but also the same Antichrist,

whom John accuseth in so many figures of his Apocalypse, forasmuch as Antichrist can be no otherwise expounded but Christ's contrary. And the Pope is so contrary unto Christ by Daniel that the matter was *toto* evident: for whereas Christ was humble, patient, chaste, poor, constant, and obedient, seeking always the fulfilling of His Father's will and not His own, the Pope, clean contrary, was proud, impatient, barbarous, rich, inconstant and disobedient, not seeking the fulfilling of any part of God's will but his own will only, in despite of all the world. . . . And it was not only proved that the Pope was thus contrary unto Christ in his doings, but also in his doctrine and ceremonies from the first to the last, too long now to rehearse; yea, and that not this living Pope alone, but all they that are dead, being comprehended under that name, especially from the time of the said Boniface the Third forward. For though the Popes have been diverse in outward actions, some less wicked than others, yet in their inward hypocrisy, they have all followed the devil's dam.'—P. 27.

Again, of the Church of Rome, the following is the writer's description:—

'I say that she is an arrant whore, a fornicatress, and an adulteress with the princes of the earth, and an express enemy of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the lawful Church the Espouse of Christ, for as Christ, &c.; so the Pope, son of the devil your god on earth in fornication engendereth on your whorish Mother Church all the bastards of perdition that believe remission of sins in him by ignorance and superstition.'—P. 28.

Note B, to which we are referred by the author in the course of this discussion on the papal supremacy, supplies a series of letters running over a period of three years, some from the archives at Brussels, some from the Imperial Library at Paris. They add little or nothing to our previous knowledge of the state of the case, as derived from the English State Papers. It is of no use to quote them as evidence of the determination of Henry to obtain a divorce, and to marry Anne Boleyn, for Mr. Froude ignores all the evidence that has been produced on this point, and affects to consider the king bent on obtaining justice. Yet every court in Christendom was aware of what was intended, and the expression of Francis I., requesting the Holy Father 'to put an end to this business as nearly 'according to the wishes of our said good brother, as is compatible with the honour of Almighty God,' shows what is plain on the face of the history, that Henry had determined to marry Anne Boleyn, but preferred doing it with the Pope's sanction if he could obtain it. There are some other statements in these letters which entirely overthrow Mr. Froude's hypothesis of the king's helplessness in any case where the nation should be strongly opposed to him. It is evident that the body of the people were quite opposed to the new match, and that there was a very strong feeling in favour of Catharine of Arragon, and her daughter Mary. The lords and commons were entirely

ridden over in this case, as they were in the subsequent divorce of Ann of Cleves, the commencement of the proceedings of which case were detailed by the king actually before they took place. Thus in one of D'Inteville's letters to the Bishop of Tarbes, we have the following :—

'The common people, foreseeing these inconveniences, are so violent against the queen, that they say a thousand shameful things of her, and of all who have supported her in her intrigues. When the war comes, no one doubts that the people will rebel, as much from fear of the dangers which I have mentioned, as from the love which is felt for the two ladies, and especially for the princess. She is so entirely beloved, that notwithstanding the laws made at the last Parliament, and the menace of death contained in it, they persist in regarding her as princess. No parliament, they say, can make her anything but the king's daughter, born in marriage, and so the king and every one else regarded her before that Parliament. Lately, when she was removed from Greenwich, a vast crowd of women, wives of citizens and others, walked before her at their husband's desire, weeping and crying, that, notwithstanding all, she was princess. Some of them were sent to the tower, but they would not retract.'

Such are a few of the statements in the face of which Mr. Froude persists in his extravagant assertion that 'Except for 'the voluntary loyalty of his subjects, half-a-dozen noblemen 'might at any moment have overturned the throne.'

The defence of the barbarous murder of the Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, is comparatively a light business. After establishing that the supremacy of the pope is not to be found in Scripture, and after the abolition of the papal authority by act of Parliament, the refusal of these two persons to consent to the king's supremacy, backed by the fact that the cardinal's hat was on its way to the Bishop of Rochester, is in itself a sufficient vindication for the king in 'shaving the bishop's crown by the shoulders, to see where the 'pope could bestow the cardinal's hat ;' whilst his serving More in the same way, after he had left them both four months in prison, and used all the means possible to dissuade them from their errors, is simply quoted as an instance of the king's leniency and clemency.

The author proceeds with the accusations *seriatim*. We pass by the defence of the usurping the supremacy, and the spoliation of the monasteries, which are only interesting as containing the stock arguments which are still used in the Roman controversy. One passage may however be quoted, because of the extreme audacity of its assertions, going, as it does, beyond even the accusations brought against the monasteries by their worst enemies. Many of them were no doubt dens of iniquity, but even the publication of the letters of the commissioners sent to investigate the case, who were their

worst enemies, only exhibits some of the houses, and some of the inhabitants, as grossly vicious. But the monasteries had no one to speak a good word for them, and so William Thomas hits them hard :—

‘There were discovered hypocrisies, murders, idolatries, miracles, sodomies, adulteries, fornications, pride, and not seven, but more than seven hundred thousand deadly sins. Alas! my heart maketh all my members to tremble with another manner of fever than is the quartain, when I remember all the abomination that was there tried out. Oh Lord God (speaking under correction), what canst thou answer to the five cities consumed with celestial fire, when they shall allege before thee the iniquities of those whom thou hast so long supported. Note well (said I), these few words, and I shall tell you. In their dark and sharp prisons there were found dead so many of their brethren, that it was a wonder; some crucified with more torments than ever were heard of, and some famished only for breaking of their superstitious silence, or some like trifle; and, especially on some children, there was used a cruelty not to be spoken with human tongue. There was of the hermits some one, that under colour of confession, had used carnally with more than two or three hundred gentlewomen and women of reputation, whose names, enrolled by commandment, they showed unto the commissioners, insomuch that some of the self-same commissioners found of their own wives titled among the rest, with what conscience I report me unto you. There was working of wonders; the friars and nuns were as whores and thieves in the open street, and there were saints that made the barren women bring forth children, unto whom there wanted no resort from all parts of the kingdom. Alas! what should I say when Ptolemy his discourse, Pliny his memory, and Augustine his pen, joined in one man, should not satisfy to make him an apt author of so detestable a history as this abomination requireth?’ P. 45.

Notes C and D, which are appended to this portion of the defence, contain some very interesting letters on the life of Cromwell; the projected escape of the Princess Mary; the insurrection in the North, and the death of Anne Boleyn, and those who were executed with her on the same accusation of adultery.

The defence of the king from the charge of ‘chopping and changing his wives at pleasure,’ is simply a rehearsal of a number of false stories, the object of which is to prove that it was more his misfortune than his fault. His first wife was divorced because she was his brother’s widow; his second wife, William Thomas finds it convenient to believe was guilty of adultery; the third lived with him the long period of eighteen months; and the fourth, whom he is said, in flagrant violation of historical truth, to have loved out of measure, was divorced after six months’ cohabitation, to satisfy the king’s conscience, ‘when he understood that she was indeed another man’s wife.’ This is the history of the abominable conduct towards Anne of Cleves, against whom Henry took a prejudice at the first moment of seeing her, and invented an excuse of a previous engagement on her part, to get rid of

her, after foully aspersing her character. Even William Thomas had not the audacity to charge Catharine Howard, the fifth wife, with actual adultery, contenting himself with alleging her vicious life before her marriage, which was proved, and adding what was never proved, that, 'at the leastwise she sought means to commit adultery.' Of the last wife, Catharine Parr, as she had the good fortune to survive him, little need be said. The author counts it 'as one of the 'special successes that the king had in this life, that after so 'many changes, his glorious chance had brought him to die 'in the arms of so faithful a spouse;' but he either did not know, or at any rate found it convenient to forget, that Catharine Parr ran a very near risk of her life on the charge of heresy, and only contrived to survive the king by managing to convince him, with the utmost dexterity and address, that her disputes with her capricious husband had been undertaken, not in the interest of theology, but for the sake of amusing him, and diverting his thoughts from his sickness and bodily sufferings.

There is something absolutely ridiculous in the author's summing up his defence:—'And thus he hath had six wives, 'whereof two have died in their beds, two have suffered for 'adultery, and two are yet living.' The author thought that the statement of Catharine Howard's adultery, which could not have borne the light singly, might stand very well in the summing up, where she is carelessly coupled with Anne Boleyn. He did not seem to calculate upon much detective power in his readers, or he would scarcely have ventured on two contradictory statements in two successive pages.

At this stage of the argument, the Catholic opponent of William Thomas is pretty well convinced of the fallacy of the religious system in which he has been educated.

'Before this reasoning,' he is made to observe, 'I was as 'constant a Catholic man as any was living; and now that I 'have heard these many arguments, I am brought into a 'labyrinth that I know not which way to get me out.'

The reader will by this time have had enough of the case for the defence, and will probably prove not so compliant an adversary as it was the good fortune of Edward the Sixth's Clerk of the Council to fall in with. We shall only add, that the pamphlet ends with a most ridiculous panegyric, first of the reigning monarch, and then of Henry.

It must not be thought that we have undertaken to review the 'Pilgrim' with the sole intention of running it down, much less of blaming Mr. Froude for republishing it. We confess

we do not admire Mr. Froude's wisdom in doing so; for though his author adopts somewhat the same view of Henry's character that he does himself, we think the perusal of these volumes will have no tendency to make people believe as Mr. Froude does, or as Mr. William Thomas professed to believe. We have much to thank the editor of this volume for, in the contribution to a future history which he has furnished in the Notes. They are full of interesting State Papers, running over the last eighteen years of the reign of Henry VIII. We can only regret that there are not more of them; and still more, that Mr. Froude has not published the originals with the translations. Some may be inclined to regret the separate publication of State Papers such as these. But after all, it may be long before either our own Government or any foreign Government will sanction the publication of the collection from which they have been selected. And if we cannot have the whole, we may be grateful for the part. We fervently hope the volume may meet with such success as to encourage the editor to present us with some more of these original documents. Such papers are the only reliable materials for history. The letters which passed between kings and ministers, cardinals and bishops, may not, perhaps, represent what the writers thought. We at least read in them what they wrote, and what they meant others to think of them; and they give us the best clue both to the characters of the writers, and the nature of the transactions in which they were engaged.

- ART. VI.—1. *Peaks, Passes, and Glaciers*. By Members of the Alpine Club. Edited by JOHN BALL, M.R.I.A. F.R.S. Fifth Edition. Longmans. 1860.
2. *Vacation Tourists and Notes of Travel in 1860*. Edited by FRANCIS GALTON, M.A. F.R.S. Macmillan. 1861.
3. *A Guide through the District of the Lakes*. Fifth Edition. By WILLIAM WORDSWORTH. 1835.

THE industrious reader of daily journals in vacation months must have observed a new class of summer correspondence, which has come, within these few years, to the rescue of those much toiling operatives, the sub-editors on duty on sweltering August nights. It is not so long since no traveller on his annual trip would have thought of taking up his pen to indite anything to the *Times* except an hotel grievance, a solar eclipse, or the vivid picture of a city in revolution. Now, on the contrary, Alpine enterprise—in possession of an organisation of its own, of men who write and men who work—has grown from books and articles into newspaper controversy, the sure sign in any party of the possession of an outside public. The respective merits of Mont Blanc and Monte Rosa season the morning's coffee and the evening tea in country houses and pleasant parsonages, and when conversation gets slack, the morality of Alpine climbing forms a very useful resource, round the dinner or the work table, for prosy seniors or flirting juniors. There is a great facility for easy truism on either side of the question, while practical common sense and gentle chivalry respectively finds its subject-matter made to hand. Probably some brother or some lover, some cousin or some friend, has climbed, or will climb, or is supposed to be about to climb, some peak still uncontaminated by the miscellaneous throng, still unrepresented in Piccadilly entertainments. The last letter in the *Times*, cheerily and jauntingly recording a fresh Alpine victory, affords a starting point only inferior to the horrid interest of a thrilling railway accident, or a gigantic metropolitan fire, equal, indeed, to the awe in which careful and palpitating dames regarded fox hunting in the jolly times when the squires indulged in deep over-night potations. In the meanwhile, the Alpine Club holds good its own. It talks, writes, records, publishes, dines, keeps up its numbers, excites the longings of the tourist public, and altogether shows itself very tolerably

indifferent to the ethical problems which its proceedings have originated.

Non nostrum est tantas, pueri, componere lites——

we should regard with equal regret the sudden cessation or the abnormal extension of the mountain mania, while of the two dangers we should be rather more inclined to fear the second. The rifle movement will not improbably, as it has been acutely said, thin the numbers of those who merely go abroad to kill time and keep themselves in exercise; young men who can spend their time more healthfully, and for themselves more amusingly, at Hythe, than in tramping from realm to realm, in exaggerated shooting coats, with cigar in mouth, and Continental Bradshaw in hand. But the reduction of this class will open out the way to another description of tourists, rather less unintelligent than the kill-times, but peculiarly unsuited for the stern toils of the mountain; the tourists who think it right to see things, and to seem to understand what they see—without any sufficient amount of original knowledge, or decided bias for anything in particular—bouncing *patres familias*, average members of learned professions, and walking young ladies. These are all persons peculiarly open to contagion. Cautious and family Swiss touring has almost in a lifetime grown up from a lounging saunter in the valleys of Hasli and Lauterbrunnen, and the towns which line the lakes of Geneva, Thun, and Lucerne, to the breezy walk across the Oberland, and the Chamouni expedition; and upwards again from these now familiar feats, to the Gemmi and the Grimsel, and the exploration of the Zermatt and the Saas valleys. It now seems to involve the attainment in the course of each single season of half-a-dozen heights, with a combined altitude of 70,000 or 80,000 feet. Feats like these are all very well for the *élite* of the Alpine Club, but they are worse than mischievous for the general English multitude. The fatal Alpine accidents, which have from time to time startled us at home, have been generally due to the culpable and boastful ignorance of some ill-advised tourist, who has thought it a fine thing to stake the lives and limbs of his honest and courageous guides against the silly reputation which he is likely to gain from his having been pulled, half numbed, and half fainting, by them, over some tremendous Col. For it must never be forgotten that high Alpine climbing is, at the best, playing with life and death. The risks must be, under the most favourable circumstances, tremendous, when, as one of the most distinguished Alpine climbers told us, the scrambler thinks himself well off if he finds just enough of ledge along the precipice to support the tips of his

fingers and the points of his toes. Under all circumstances, too, good or bad, the main share of the merit is justly due to those by whom the chief precautions are taken, the chief investigations made, and the chief dangers won—the guides. The traveller, therefore, who pays one of these fine fellows to imperil not only his own existence, but the livelihood of his family, for the sake of adding one more asterisk to the list of the Alpine Club's ascended peaks, incurs a great responsibility. So does the climber himself, for suicide is no more lawful than murder, and the lives which are risked are often among the choicest and those which we should least willingly spare. Professor Tyndall's adventure, to which we shall have to refer, in the ice chimney at the Matterhorn was sufficiently exciting, but the life at stake in that dilemma is one which has given many pledges to science. Still, we should be sorry to see Alpine scaling go out of fashion. Whether the thing is philosophical or not, it is a plain fact that muscle and pluck not only possess, but are meant to possess, a great and salutary influence in the conduct of the world's affairs, and that the nation which has the luck to exhibit them most conspicuously in the face of its neighbours, in the least pugnacious and offensive manner, goes far to win both respect and power. Now then, there can hardly be anything much less pugnacious or offensive than waging war against glaciers and peaks. In this campaign England has got the monopoly. The Alpine summits are politically the property of the Swiss Confederation, but practically they are the freehold of the Alpine Club, which has its head quarters in London. Germans reason upon this English passion for heights, and are puzzled; Frenchmen do not attempt to reason, and are still more puzzled; and among their many imitations of Englishmen, Americans hardly yet seem to have hit upon this particular one.

The bull
That makes *this* run is John, not Jonathan.

What the natives in general think of those adventurous islanders, whether they reverence them as inspired, or despise them as madmen, or with oriental feeling think them mad, and therefore reverence them, it is not within our power to say. Perhaps their feeling is a sort of dull gratitude to Providence for having created England to pour francs into Swiss pockets. But the result is the same, the topmost peaks of Europe are the Briton's inheritance. It is somehow natural that it should be so. The healthy old Norse blood, of which so many rivulets circulate through our veins, still makes itself felt in this late century of artificial civilization. The same spirit which makes

the Englishman emigrate so well, where he has to cut and win his way before him through the forest; the same spirit which makes him hunt and shoot, boat and play cricket for his pastime; the same spirit which makes him shoulder the volunteer rifle at the first breath of danger, drives him to attempt the Matterhorn. Science has made some of the best climbers, and they deserve the first praise. Daring is the motive power of the second class, and under due limitations we do not refuse praise to the men who are cautious, not less than brave, and who will not voluntarily risk lives for vanity or selfishness.

But all the more strongly we are convinced that those who can be morally justified in running these risks and incurring these fatigues are an exceptional body, and that the person who endeavours, without being tolerably sure of his vocation, to follow their example, is not far short of belonging to the same class as those proverbially are, who are their own lawyers. Albert Smith did get to the top of Mont Blanc and he came down again, and society was the gainer by this daring attempt of the jovial Londoner. But any guide at Chamouni will tell the inquirer that the attempt was a very foolhardy one, and that nothing could have pulled the experimentalist through but the extraordinary number of guides whom he took with him. One of them was casually asked by a traveller whether he had gone up with 'M. Smith,' and answered, 'O yes, that it was he himself who had supported M. Smith when he fainted on the summit, and gave him spirits to revive him.'

In proof that we are not exaggerating the perils of the enterprise, we shall call upon mountaineers to tell their own tale, and for the purpose, we shall not go further than the records of Alpine scramblings contained in Mr. Galton's *Vacation Tourists* in 1860. We should have gladly given a *précis* of Professor Tyndall's narrative of the frightful route by which, in company with Mr. Hawkins, he proceeded from Lauterbrunnen to the *Æggisch-horn* by the *Lauinen-Thor*; or, in plainer language, scrambled from the valley of the Aar, clean over the central Oberland group, into the valley of the Rhone. But we pass on to a still more daring feat of these two travellers, as narrated by Mr. Hawkins, which followed immediately after that passage—the attempted, but unhappily not perfectly successful, ascent of the steepest and boldest of European mountains, the Matterhorn, or Mont Cervin, on whose side they were the first of travellers to plant even a single footstep, so gloomily remote stands this giant peak among its solitary glaciers:

'Actual contact immensely increases one's impressions of this, the hardest and strongest of all the mountain masses of the Alps; its form is more remarkable than that of other mountains, not by chance, but because it is built of

more massive and durable materials, and more solidly put together : nowhere have I seen such astonishing masonry. The broad gneiss blocks are generally smooth and compact, with little appearance of splintering or weathering. Tons of rock, in the shape of boulders, must fall almost daily down its sides, but the amount of these, even in the course of centuries, is as nothing compared with the mass of the mountain ; the ordinary processes of disintegration can have little or no effect on it. If one were to follow Mr. Ruskin, in speculating on the manner in which the Alpine peaks can have assumed their present shape, it seems as if such a mass as this can have been blocked out only while rising from the sea, under the action of waves such as beat against the granite headlands of the Land's End. Once on dry land, it must stand as it does now, apparently for ever.'

Of the various perils which the adventurers had to encounter in the ascent, and again, upon the descent, we shall only offer one as a sample of what composes the summer pleasures of an Alpine Clubbist :—

'Soon our difficulties begin ; but I despair of relating the incidents of this part of our route, so numerous and bewildering were the obstacles along it ; and the details of each have somewhat faded from the memory. We are immersed in a wilderness of blocks, roofed and festooned with huge plates and stalactites of ice, so large that one is half disposed to seize hold and clamber up them. Round, over, and under them we go ; often progress seems impossible ; but Bennen, ever in advance, and perched like a bird on some projecting crag, contrives to find a way. Now we crawl singly along a narrow ledge of rock, with a wall on one side, and nothing on the other : there is no hold for hands or alpenstock, and the ledge slopes a little, so that if the nails in our boots hold not, down we shall go ; in the middle of it a piece of rock juts out, which we ingeniously duck under, and emerge just under a shower of water, which there is no room to escape from. Presently comes a more extraordinary place : a perfect chimney of rock, cased all over with hard, black ice, about an inch thick. The bottom leads out into space, and the top is somewhere in the upper regions : there is absolutely nothing to grasp at, and to this day I cannot understand how a human being could get up or down it unassisted. Bennen, however, rolls up it somehow, like a cat ; he is at the top, and beckons Tyndall to advance ; my turn comes next ; I endeavour to mount by squeezing myself against the sides, but near the top friction suddenly gives way, and down comes my weight upon the rope :—a stout haul from above, and now one knee is upon the edge, and I am safe : Carrol is pulled up after me. After a time, we get off the rocks, and mount a slope of ice, which curves rapidly over for about three yards to our left, and then (apparently) drops at once to the Zmutt glacier.'

The same volume contains the ascent of the Allelein-horn, by Mr. Leslie Stephen. One parenthetical event in crossing an hitherto untrudged glacier, is dismissed in a few words :—

'Suddenly, one of the party all but disappeared. A narrow crevasse had opened beneath him like a trap-door. With his feet wedged against one side, his shoulders against the other, and his back resting upon nothing at all, it was well for him that the crevasse had not been a little broader. The man behind caught him by the collar as he went down, and in a moment he was on his feet again, on sound footing. But the view of the two parallel walls of green ice sinking vertically downwards into utter darkness, has often come back to me since. Somehow, no one even then suggested the rope, and we plodded quietly and sleepily along—fortunately without further accident. I

hope, however, that I learnt a lesson as to the propriety of using the rope on such occasions. It is true that a man has in general no business to fall down a crevasse. A concealed crevasse is almost always so narrow that it is rather difficult than otherwise to fall down it without touching either side. If you are carrying your alpenstock "at the trail," so as to form a bridge as you fall, or if you throw yourself well backwards or forwards directly you feel your footing give, you must come upon a firm support. Still, no one has a right to presume so far upon his skill and presence of mind as not to adopt a precaution which secures absolute safety. There have, indeed, been warnings enough lately, to impress this upon most people's minds.'

In the descent a 'buttress' of rock was encountered:—

'The buttress I have mentioned may be compared to the roof of a church tilted up at a steep angle; the tiles on either side representing the snow-slopes, which on one side reached only a short way to the edge of the cliffs, and on the other, or western side, stretched much farther to a level and easy glacier. Now, it is generally pretty good going along an arête, even though inclined at a considerable angle, so long as you can keep, as it were, on the backbone, and have a slope on each side of you. It is like walking along the ridge of the church roof; but when the roof makes a sudden break in its elevation, as at the joining of the nave and chancel, or when spikes suddenly protrude and drive you to circumvent them by making a short excursion on the tiles, the difficulty is very much exaggerated. In our case the spikes were represented by sharp spires of impracticable rock, which at once sent us down on to a snow-slope, decidedly steeper and more treacherous than ordinary roofing-tiles.'

We pass over the narrative of such perils as a near escape from a deadly glissade in company with a broad sheet of new snow a few inches thick, and of destruction from the huge bounding stones, which the members of the party who kept an upper course, contrived to send rolling on their companions. A greater danger was soon attained:—

'By this means we kept carefully down to the end of the rock, and then, perched upon a narrow ledge, began to consider what was to be done next. We were looking down a blank wall of ice, inclined, I should guess, at some 45°, and reaching without intermission to the glacier, at a depth of several hundred feet below. I knew, by very disagreeable experience, that it would probably take several hours to cut steps down to it; and yet, near us, the ice showed no snow on its surface to help us. It was already late, the sun was near setting, and the mists were getting thicker every moment. Soon, even the glacier below us was entirely concealed.

After a lively discussion between the guides, we adopted the following plan, suggested by the ancient and many-counselled Peter: By fastening our two ropes together, we obtained a length of about a hundred feet. Moritz Anthonmatten then tied one end round his waist, and was let down by the rest of the party to the full extent of the rope. The ice along which he slid was so steep and so free from snow, that his weight was borne almost entirely by the rope. When he was let down as far as possible, there was still no foot-hold to be obtained. He quickly cut a couple of steps in the ice, and then freeing himself from the rope, cut a line of steps in a horizontal direction to a part of the slope where the snow seemed to be deeper. Another guide was let down in the same way, and helped to polish up the steps. Then each of the travellers, in succession, was lowered. We felt ourselves perfectly helpless

bundles, sliding along the vast sheet of hard ice which sank into the mists at our feet, and in which it was almost impossible to obtain hold enough with the point of one's alpenstock, to serve as the slightest drag.'

We flatter ourselves that we need not prolong our extracts in proof of our position. What then, if the higher summits are unattainable to the general run of masculine Swiss tourists, and to all the women, are these excluded pilgrims to occupy themselves about? We use emphatically the significative monosyllable 'all,' for we have no hesitation in pronouncing an absolute veto against any woman attempting the extreme perils and difficulties of exploits against which the very nature of her habitual dress pleads a decided prohibition, not to talk of the tricks with which the nerves are apt to pay off those who habitually disregard their existence. No woman has a right to court such adventures, nor have many men. Have the generality of travellers much to complain of? The answer to this inquiry must be sought in the character and quality of that which is left behind for them to enjoy.

A few samples picked out of the easiest and most accessible centres of Swiss scenery, the scenes which not only women, but children can and do habitually compass, may not be unacceptable, if they tend to settle the question. We venture to start with the best known in the list of Swiss mountains, the green Rigi, on the shore of the Lake of Lucerne, and we venture to say that it affords a panorama which is so lovely, that not all the conglomerated and cosmopolitan vulgarity which meets in the hotel on the summit, can avail to pall the pleasure of the sight. The serpentine twistings of the glorious lake of the Four Cantons, the blue and oval basin of the lake of Zug, so sheer under the gazer's feet, that one jump might seem sufficient to plunge him deep into its waters; the tortuous labyrinth of hoary peaks, south, east, and west; to the north, the more level district of hills and dales towards the lake of Sempach, serving as a foil to the rugged beauties of the remaining horizon, all combine to create a spectacle of beauty, which, once to have seen, is never to forget. Yet the ascent of the Rigi (2,000 feet higher than Snowdon), is simply a healthy day's exercise, a long walk, not more really difficult or dangerous than the climb of Greenwich or Primrose Hill, up a steep and grassy ascent, winding in and out of the woods, which man, woman, or child, their stout staff in hand, might easily accomplish, if only time enough is allowed for that which had best on no account be hurried over. Again, the Mer de Glace, by Chamouni, a spectacle of rugged sublimity which requires not the pen, but the pencil, or, still better, the camera, to describe it, is the prize of a no more than sharp scramble over stones

and rhododendrons, and through the trunks of spruces. That remarkable *coup-d'œil* of the flank of the Jungfrau from the Wengern Alp, across an apparently fathomless abyss, where that huge mountain rises sheer before the spectator, like a scene in a play infinitely magnified, is attainable by any one of tolerable strength at the trouble of a few hours' healthful upland footing.

But we are being tempted to linger too long on places which everybody knows something about. We must introduce our model moderate tourist to a centre of Alpine scenery, which is only now growing into that celebrity which it deserves from its facilities of access, combined with the gigantic beauties which it exhibits. Seeing that among the famous Alpine chains, the Bernese Oberland, and that great group culminating in Monte Rosa, which separates the Valais from Italy, are the loftiest and the grandest, so far as Mont Blanc may not incline the scale on the mere score of height, the discovery of some 'specular mount,' which, standing midway between them, might link the two systems into a well combined single panorama, is obviously a desideratum to be earnestly longed for by the tourist. How far this want has been realized, we proceed to explain. No one who has crossed the Simplon from the Valaisian side, will have forgotten his start from the rugged, picturesque, more than half Italian town of Brieg, with its dirty, uncivil inn, and general air of fussy laziness. The Alpine sight-seer must shut his eyes to the attractions of Napoleon's broad and well-made road, stretching away to the right, and, taking the course to the left, across the diminished Rhone by the neighbouring bridge, rattle a few miles in *char-à-banc* along the uneven but very viable tract which follows the Rhone glen, till it leads him to the wood-built, thoroughly Swiss village of Viesch. Here carriage travelling ends; women may be indulged with horses, but to men, their own legs and their own alpenstock are the surest way. Sheer over Viesch rises the object of this expedition, the Eggisch-horn, situate indeed in the Valais, but bordering on the Oberland. For a few thousand feet up the path winds in and out of spruce forests, and does not offer anything beyond the average amount of upland beauty. At last the woody zone is passed, and the traveller treads the Alpine down-like pasturage, where, upon a grassy ledge, snugly protected by a steep rise behind him, nestles, at some 7,000 feet above the sea, the un-architectural, but roomy and comfortable Hotel of the Jungfrau, kept by that active intelligent landlord,¹ M. Wellig, who a few

¹ In Switzerland the innkeepers are in fact the squires. They are almost always the richest and most important members of their respective communities, repre-

years since discovering, or having had pointed out to him, the amenities and advantages of this special height, with great labour conveyed the materials up the steeps, acting as his own architect, his own builder and surveyor. The hostelry was speedily taken under the notice of the Alpine Club, to which it serves as a sort of club-house and rendezvous for these high-mountain adventurers. But as we are endeavouring to show, it is equally available for the delectation of the less ambitious climbers, whose most serious business in the Alps is the club-man's play on off-days. The summit of the *Äggisch-horn* is between 2,000 and 3,000 feet higher than the hotel, and is calculated to be some 9,700 feet above the sea. It is accordingly advisable to make the hotel a sleeping-place for one or two, if not more nights. The second morning will be devoted to the ascent to the summit, over ground where no tree will grow, but which is luxuriant in humbler vegetation; for the herbage, as soft and springy as a *Sussex* down, is speckled with innumerable blue gentians, and tufts of large wild heart's-ease. The road is rocky, and at some hundred feet above the hotel there is no longer any possibility of riding, but no lady, with a tolerably clear head and good footing, need have any doubts as to the practicability of her enjoying the delights of a completed ascent. The mountain just overpasses the height at which snow constantly lies, and so the course every now and then leads over streaks and patches of it, till at last the top cone is attained, a huge pile of detached and tumbled stones, which one would be tempted to believe the gigantic cairn of some antediluvian man of valour, were nature's architecture not manifest on all around. The summit once attained, if the day be clear and bright, the reward transcends the toil.

The *Äggisch-horn*, as we have said, rises midway between the *Oberland* peaks and those of the *Valais*. Of course the aspect of the former mountains, the well-known *Finsteraar-horn*, *Jungfrau*, *Mönch*, *Eiger*, *Aletsch-horn*, *Viescher-hörner*, is the contrary one to the familiar perspective from *Grindelwald* and the *Wengern Alp*, as it is the south side which is here displayed. In some respects this southern side is certainly inferior to the northern one, for the mountains are set upon a kind of table-land, of which, indeed, the *Äggisch-horn* itself, standing as it does to the north of the *Rhone*, is a kind of outlying spur. On the other side they rise from a comparatively depressed level. But out of this apparent inferiority

sentatives in the legislature, and so forth. The arrangement has its advantages, but there is a dark side too, when the traveller wishes to protest before the magistrate against some extortionate charge; for it is likely enough that he may find that Boniface himself is justice.

grows a peculiar feature of transcendent grandeur. What we venture to call a table-land, is in reality a broad valley, sloping from the north in a curve to the south-west, and skirting the northern flank of the *Æggisch-horn*; and what a valley! not bottomed by green pastures, not stony and desolate, not the basin of a sparkling lake, but all of it for miles and miles ahead hirsute with the tumbled, crevassed masses of that which still possesses the reputation of being the largest glacier in the world—the *Aletsch Glacier*. As sheer under the *Æggisch-horn*, as the *Lake of Zug* is sheer under the *Rigi*, this huge ice-stream glides imperceptibly down to the valley of the *Rhone*. But the wonder does not cease here. Close under the peak of the mountain, due north, or nearly so—so perpendicularly under the spectator's eye, that it seems as if a stone might be dropped in, is a deep green lake, fenced on one side by perpendicular cliffs, not of stone, but of congealed water—the melting, in short, of the glacier ice, which, from some reason which we do not pretend to fathom, here suddenly resumes its liquidity to form the *Märjelen See*, a lake in which the icebergs float—icebergs of fresh water—vast masses of the glacier, which suddenly break off from the translucent cliff, and thunder into the deep pool.

The view to the south is of a different character, but equally—perhaps even more grand. The *Æggisch-horn's* own green and woody side, and the opposite bank of the *Rhone* valley, seen from the foreground, and the mountains to the left of the semi-circle, are not of the first class. But as the eye ranges towards the right, it falls successively upon summits, whose grandeur all who have seen must for ever remember, but can never adequately embody in description. First comes the *Fletschorn*, two huge masses at right angles to each other, of which the one nearest the spectator presents its end as the other does its flank, the two meeting like the junction of the nave and transept of a vast cathedral. Further on is the *Mischabel*, the highest of all the mountains wholly and exclusively in *Switzerland*, rising, in a cluster of stately, curved masses, rather domical than pyramidal, yet full of dignity. Next comes *Monte Rosa*, but from the *Æggisch-horn* it does not show to advantage: not so the next mountain in the series, the unique and wonderful *Matterhorn*, which here exhibits its steepled form with that strange shadowy suggestion of a thatched cottage, which its summit assumes, just as distinctly as at *Zermatt*, though so much further off. Still to the right of the *Matterhorn* is the single stately pyramid of the *Weisshorn*, ascended a few weeks since, for the first time, by Professor *Tyndall*, as recorded by him in the omnigossiping columns of the *Illustrated News*, which disputes

with the Mischalul for the first prize of grandeur, next after the incomparable Matterhorn. Very far away to the right, a small remote elevation is perceived in a distant range, which the guides tell you is Mont Blanc. There is no reason that it should not be so. Its presence does not help the *Æggisch-horn* panorama, and its absence would not mar it; but it is well that something of all the great Alpine peaks should be visible from that point.

We fully believe that the expert Alpine topographer would have no difficulty in indicating many points respectively as easy of access as the Rigi or the *Æggisch-horn* (for there is more than one shade of difference between the viability of the two summits), and respectively offering panoramas equal in interest to those which are open from the Lucerne and the Valaisian summits. This year has opened out a new summit, the Bell Alp, on the south flank of the Rhone valley. By our own selection of those two instances of the profitableness of sub-Alpine climbing, we expose and confess ourselves one of the million servile followers of those who have pioneered the way before us: who can only nobly dare where they are sure to amply dine, and comfortably sleep afterwards, in some established hostelry. Well, let it be so, and let our enjoyment of the Alps be graduated at one degree: it will the more assuredly follow, that there may be many degrees of safe enjoyment between that which we revelled in, and the boiling point of perpetual snow. No sophistry of the most muscular experimentalists can stop the infinite variety of expeditions over the lower passes, and up the secondary peaks. Mind, eye, body, may derive equal pleasurable and healthy occupation from the pursuit of these moderate successes; and we unhesitatingly resume our little thankful office of counsellor by urging all tourists (women as well as men, in these days of fastness) who have not any special scientific end in view, or who are not conscious of physical powers, well tried at home in muscular feats and regular exercise, or of some special vocation to the enterprise, to look to a prolonged season passed in the continuous enjoyment of such feats, rather than to one or two overdrawn drafts upon the bank of health, discounted on the crest of some awful summit, painfully gained, and barely enjoyed at the very moment of acquisition, from the exhaustion of the much taxed forces.

We are prepared for the question, why, admitting our premises, there can be any particular reason for the average tourist expending time and cash upon a Swiss tour, when the British Highlands offer peaks relatively as lofty as those which lie in Switzerland below the line of snow and Alpine Club. Without

doubt, if men were merely monkeys, and travelling simply meant climbing, there would be considerable weight in this demurrer. But, for our own part, we regard the suggested comparison between the Alpine and Pyrenean, and the mountain clusters of Great Britain, as a simple impertinence towards the grandeur and beauty of the latter. It is simply degrading and vilifying to drag them into a comparison which they do not seek, and are not prepared to meet: the gauge of battle has, indeed, been thrown down on their behalf by a very distinguished champion, but in his attempt he vindicates his patriotism at the expense of his discretion and discrimination. The champion of the native mountains bears the memorable name of William Wordsworth, who, in his pretty, though, perhaps, occasionally crotchety, 'Guide to the Lakes,' has spun a sufficiently ingenious argument to prove the equality to, if not the absolute superiority, of the Lake scenery over that of Switzerland.

'For example, if a traveller be among the Alps, let him surrender up his mind to the fury of the gigantic torrents, and take delight in the contemplation of their almost irresistible violence, without complaining of the monotony of their foaming course, or being disgusted with the muddiness of the water—apparent even where it is violently agitated. In Cumberland and Westmorland, let not the comparative weakness of the streams prevent him from sympathizing with such impetuosity as they possess; and, making the most of the present objects, let him, as he justly may do, observe with admiration the unrivalled brilliancy of the water, and that variety of motion, mood, and character, that arises out of the want of those resources by which the power of the streams in the Alps is supported.—Again, with respect to the mountains: though these are comparatively of diminutive size, though there is little of perpetual snow, and no voice of summer-avalanches is heard among them; and though traces left by the ravage of the elements are here comparatively rare and unimpressive, yet out of this very deficiency proceeds a sense of stability and permanence that is, to many minds, more grateful—

"While the coarse rushes to the sweeping breeze
Sigh forth their ancient melodies."

'Among the Alps are few places that do not preclude this feeling of tranquil sublimity. Havoc, and ruin, and desolation, and encroachment, are everywhere more or less obtruded; and it is difficult, notwithstanding the naked loftiness of the *pikes*, and the snow-capped summits of the *mounts*, to escape from the depressing sensation, that the whole are in a rapid process of dissolution; and, were it not that the destructive agency must abate as the heights diminish, would, in time to come, be levelled with the plains. Nevertheless, I would relish to the utmost the demonstrations of every species of power at work to effect such changes.'

'As a resident among the Lakes, I frequently hear the scenery of this country compared with that of the Alps; and therefore a few words shall be added to what has been incidentally said upon that subject.

'If we could recall, to this region of lakes, the native pine-forests, with which many hundred years ago a large portion of the heights was covered, then, during spring and autumn, it might frequently, with much propriety, be compared to Switzerland,—the elements of the landscape would be the same—one

country representing the other in miniature. Towns, villages, churches, rural seats, bridges and roads; green meadows and arable grounds, with their various produce, and deciduous woods of diversified foliage which occupy the vales and lower regions of the mountains, would, as in Switzerland, be divided by dark forests from ridges and round-topped heights covered with snow, and from pikes and sharp declivities imperfectly arrayed in the same glittering mantle; and the resemblance would be still more perfect on those days when vapours, resting upon, and floating around the summits, leave the elevation of the mountains less dependent upon the eye than on the imagination. But the pine-forests have wholly disappeared: and only during late spring and early autumn is realized here that assemblage of the imagery of different seasons, which is exhibited through the whole summer among the Alps—winter in the distance—and warmth, leafy woods, verdure and fertility at hand, and widely diffused.

Striking, then, from among the permanent materials of the landscape, that stage of vegetation which is occupied by pine-forests, and, above that, the perennial snows, we have mountains, the highest of which little exceed 3000 feet, while some of the Alps do not fall short of 14,000 or 15,000, and 8,000 or 10,000 is not an uncommon elevation. Our tracts of wood and water are almost as diminutive in comparison; therefore, as far as sublimity is dependent upon absolute bulk and height, and atmospherical influences in connexion with these, it is obvious that there can be no rivalry. But a short residence among the British mountains will furnish abundant proof, that after a certain point of elevation,—viz., that which allows of compact and fleecy clouds settling upon, or sweeping over, the summits—the sense of sublimity depends more upon form and relation of objects to each other than upon their actual magnitude; and that an elevation of 3000 feet is sufficient to call forth in a most impressive degree the creative, and magnifying, and softening powers of the atmosphere. Hence, on the score even of sublimity, the superiority of the Alps is by no means so great as might hastily be inferred; and as to the *beauty* of the lower regions of the Swiss mountains, it is noticeable that, as they are all regularly mown, their surface has nothing of that mellow tone and variety of hues by which mountain turf, that is never touched by the scythe, is distinguished. On the smooth and steep slopes of the Swiss hills, these plots of verdure do indeed agreeably unite their colour with that of the deciduous trees, or make a lively contrast with the dark green pine-groves that define them, and among which they run in endless variety of shapes—but this is most pleasing *at first sight*; the permanent gratification of the eye requires finer gradations of tone, and a more delicate blending of hues into each other. Besides, it is only in spring and late autumn that cattle animate by their presence the Swiss lawns; and though the pastures of the higher regions where they feed during the summer are left in their natural state of flowery herbage, those pastures are so remote, that their texture and colour are of no consequence in the composition of any picture in which a lake of the Vales is a feature. Yet in those lofty regions, how vegetation is invigorated by the genial climate of that country! Among the luxuriant flowers there met with, groves, or forests, if I may so call them, of monks-hood are frequently seen; the plant of deep, rich blue, and as tall as in our gardens; and this at an elevation where, in Cumberland, Icelandic moss would only be found, or the stony summits be utterly bare.

We have, then, for the colouring of Switzerland, *principally* a vivid green herbage, black woods, and dazzling snows, presented in masses with a grandeur to which no one can be insensible; but not often graduated by nature into soothing harmony, and so ill suited to the pencil, that though abundance of good subjects may be there found, they are not such as can be deemed *characteristic* of the country; nor is this unsuitness confined to colour: the forms of the mountains, though many of them in some points of view the noblest that

can be conceived, are apt to run into spikes and needles, and present a jagged outline which has a mean effect, transferred to canvas. This must have been felt by the ancient masters, for, if I am not mistaken, they have not left a single landscape, the materials of which are taken from the *peculiar* features of the Alps; yet Titian passed his life almost in their neighbourhood; the Poussins and Claude must have been well acquainted with their aspects; and several admirable painters, as Tibaldi and Luino, were born among the Italian Alps.'

'Deeming the points in which Alpine imagery is superior to British too obvious to be insisted upon, I will observe that the deciduous woods, though in many places unapproachable by the axe, and triumphing in the pomp and prodigality of Nature, have, in general, neither the variety nor beauty which would exist in those of the mountains of Britain, if left to themselves. Magnificent walnut-trees grow upon the plains of Switzerland; and fine trees, of that species, are found scattered over the hill-sides: birches also grow here and there in luxuriant beauty; but neither these, nor oaks, are ever a prevailing tree, nor can even be said to be common; and the oaks, as far as I had an opportunity of observing, are greatly inferior to those of Britain. Among the interior valleys the proportion of beeches and pines is so great that other trees are scarcely noticeable; and surely such woods are at all seasons much less agreeable than that rich and harmonious distribution of oak, ash, elm, birch, and alder, that formerly clothed the sides of Snowdon and Helvellyn; and of which no mean remains still survive at the head of Ulswater. On the Italian side of the Alps, chesnut and walnut-trees grow at a considerable height on the mountains; but, even there, the foliage is not equal in beauty to the "natural product" of this climate.'

We have extracted so much at length, that we must here suspend our work of quoting. Wordsworth goes on with considerations which have more to do with the Italian lakes than with high Alpine scenery, such as the inferiority of the vine and the olive cultivation over the 'pastured lawns, coverts of haw-thorn, of wild rose and honeysuckle, and the majesty of forest trees,' which he claims for his native Cumbrian scenes.

It will not have escaped the notice of our readers, that the imaginative writer of these passages dwells upon the accidents rather than the essentials of the two classes of scenery which he compares; and the question which he incidentally raises of the absence of the 'savage' in the landscapes of the old painters, even of those born under the Alps, is one which is well known in these days of art criticism to be a matter which calls for a far wider solution than that which he adventured. Still there is considerable truth in his assertions, as far as they go; setting aside the fantastic depreciation of that loveliest of deciduous trees, the beech: indeed, we may say, that as far as they go, we are inclined to accept them as extremely accurate; but they only state an incomplete truth, and the points of the argument which they overlook are precisely those upon which the entire controversy really hinges. The enthusiastic champion of Cumbria plays double or quits when he treats the district of which he holds the brief as *ejusdem generis* with the higher altitudes, against which he does not fear

to pit it. In order to ascertain the value of his assumptions, we may suppose the controversy reduced to the simple and practical test of a tourist's preference; and thus, by bringing it to the bar of a material and subjective issue, we shall be in a position to see where its strength and where its weakness lies, and thus show ourselves that we are really far more truly the friends of British scenery such as it is, than the writers who risk its being undervalued by critics in proportion as it is over-rated by its advocates.

The unconscious fallacy which underlies the position assumed by Wordsworth is the sharp division of scenery which he implicitly makes into mountain and non-mountain scenery, and the consequent explicit assumption that all districts which fall under the first head admit of comparison between themselves, inasmuch as they stand in direct contrast to all other portions of country which are not mountainous. But the direct contrary happens to be the case. It is not a month since a writer in the *Saturday Review* truly, though rather whimsically and despairingly, complained that he could not make out what was a mountain and what a hill; and hazarded the conjecture that the distinction was more geographical than real, in which he was not far from wrong, given on one side that Celtic amplification which has created Wicklow mountains, and on the other that Saxon moderation which talks of the Malvern or Derbyshire hills. But below the altitude of the Wicklow mountains and Derbyshire hills there exist many classes of scenery eminently picturesque, and depending for their picturesqueness on inequality of ground, which under the Wordsworthian system would either not find their place at all in the philosophy of scenery, or else find one as ludicrously below their merits as that which he attempts to assign to Welsh and Cumbrian mountains is extravagantly above their deserts.

To return to our text. The inquiry whether the tourist had better find himself at Lucerne or Ambleside, when bent on a holiday, the convenience being assumed as equal on either side; if asked in the way of an absolute test of the comparative merits of the scenery of Lucerne and of Ambleside, is as wholly irrelevant to the issue as the comparison between Ambleside and Tunbridge Wells as an eligible centre for six weeks' summering would be as a gauge of Cumbrian and Wealden scenery. Yet if the theory propounded by the late Laureate were sound, it ought to bear being thus reduced to a material form. The Lakes are of course grander than the Weald, but each is so totally distinct from the other in many respects, that each is capable of giving pure and unmixed gratification without the alloy of impertinent comparison. The Peak of Derbyshire may

be a sort of half-way house, but its existence neither brings them nearer together nor mends or mars either. In the same way, Cumbrian and Alpine scenery—the lower mountain and the upper mountain scenery—as we may designate them, have respectively so many and such strongly marked distinctions as to entitle each to immunity from any comparison with the other.

In other respects, however, there is a strong family likeness between the two mountain districts, but in admitting this likeness we must, as we have indicated, also admit that the chain of likeness has links far below the lowest sweep of upland country having any claim to the appellation of mountain. We again fall back upon the question what makes mountains and what makes hills? Eternal snows do not constitute the distinction, or there would be no mountains in Great Britain. Absence of wood from the summit, a peaked outline, above all visible rock cropping out of the soil, are probably the best criteria which we can offer, but even these criteria are confounded by the question of comparative scale. As the traveller enters Dove Dale from the south, working up from the more level districts of Derbyshire and Staffordshire, he cannot fail to have his attention arrested by the twin eminences of Thorpe Cloud and Bunster, which guard the portals of the Dale like two vigilant sentinels. Their shape would elevate these peaks into the rank of mountains, their measurement reduces them to the class of hills. The long narrow dale to which they give access, measuring several miles in length from Ilam Hall to Walton and Cotton's Fishing House at Beresford Hall, '*piscatoribus sacrum*,' fulfils in the fantastical beauty of its rocks and caves and woody slopes and tumbling waters, all the conditions of a mountain glen or pass, but yet inexorable figures forbid to it the name of mountain scenery. Some miles to the north of that Fishing House, in the broad upper valley of the same river, are the prominent heights of High Wealdon, in form a perfect pyramid, and grandest as we have seen it, with the full moon rising behind it, and of Crome Tor, a savage point of tumbled rock. Each of these hills ought to be a mountain, and yet each of them can only be considered as a hill except upon principles of sovereign neglect for all tables of height and superficial area.

More familiar instances come even nearer home, within the metropolitan county of Surrey. The two parallel glens by which Box Hill runs, descending at its north-west buttress into the vale of Mickleham, are perfectly mountainous in their character. The heathery height of Leith Hill darkly rising from the broad Wealden sweep of cultivated fields, and commanding a vast sylvan view as far as the bold line of the South Downs, which White in his '*Selborne*' dignifies with the title of

mountains, is but a hill, and yet its character is that of a dwarfed mountain. Where then can we draw the distinction, or is there really any distinction to be drawn? Philosophically, none at all, but practically we may just as well say for sake of saying something, that an upland in order to graduate as a mountain must prove 1,500 feet elevation above the sea combined with some peculiar rockiness or peakiness of outline, or the possession of notable panoramic advantages. This distinction will help us to clear our notions as between the Peak and the Weald on one side, and Cumbria and the Peak on the other; but it does not help us in the land where the mountains range from 5,000 to 15,000 feet high, and still less in the Himalayan range, where twice 15,000 is the limit. We have come back to the same fact with which we started when investigating the question from another point of view, that the Wordsworthian attempt to create, *implicitly*, a sharply defined class of mountain scenery, as contrasted with all other kinds of scenery not absolutely flat, and then *explicitly* to institute a comparison between two groups of such mountain scenery with a considerable indifference to the question, whether the altitudes were 15,000 or 3,000 feet, must be a self-proved failure. From Holland to Nepaul the gradations are infinite, and being infinite they must for the purpose of comparison be, incorrectly, no doubt, but roughly and readily, lumped into a few classes, each class with extremities widely different from each other, and in every case with its superior extremity closely touching to the inferior extremity of the one above it. With great diffidence and with a single eye to European upland scenery in its actual climatic and geological conditions, we venture to propose the three classes of hill scenery, lower mountain scenery, and upper mountain scenery, only claiming possession of the first two for Great Britain. Hill scenery and lower mountain scenery would glide into each other in the Peak and the western Fells of Yorkshire. The Weald and Surrey would be unquestionably 'hill country,' and Cumbria mountainous. The debateable land beyond lower and upper mountain scenery would be found in one aspect of the question in the Black Forest and the Jura, and in the other in Lapland or Iceland, where, from the high latitude, the peculiar features of Alpine and Pyrenean mountains would find their correlatives at so comparatively insignificant an altitude above the sea.

Assuming then this terminology, what are the distinctive differences which at least as clearly mark off upper mountain from lower mountain scenery, as lower mountain is marked off from hill scenery, and which stamps Wordsworth's attempted parallel between the Lakes and Switzerland, to be as much a

wrong to the former as a comparison between them and the Weald would be to the latter? Vast tracts of everlasting snow, and black unvegetating rocks, are in themselves a distinctive feature, which preach their own existence on the housetops of the globe. In light and in shade, at morning and at evening, under blue skies and under cloud, when darkling and when rosy, the snow field asserts its own individual and peculiar value. Some traveller who had lived many years dreaming of, but never beholding a snowy mountain, and who rose at four on a cloudless summer morning, at Lucerne, to drink in the spectacle of which that town is the constant guardian, might, if such could be found, be appealed to in evidence of this assertion. Again, the glacier is a thing of itself, as much as the snow field, in the anatomy of landscape. Nothing that is not a glacier, can supply the place of a glacier, any more than anything else can supply the place of a lake, or a wood, or a torrent. Nothing else in temperate and tropical climates combines the white coloration, the broken outline, the blue crevasse. Frozen seas within the arctic and antarctic circles may offer similar phenomena, but high arctic latitudes lie out of the scope of this discussion. Mixing, too, as the Swiss glaciers do with the higher and with the lower types of beauty, now clinging to the bases of the topmost peaks, now shouldering through the woods, and tumbling into the pastoral and arable valleys, they are not merely a theoretical but a practical and constantly felt element of beauty.

But the snow field and the glacier, beautiful as they both may be, are but factors of that superior system of beauty which parts off the higher from lower mountain scenery. The existence of either under our actual atmospherical conditions, (postponing the question of former glaciers in our own mountains,) is the result of exceeding altitude, and in the existence of that altitude are involved those conditions of complication to which, after all, we must recur for the desired distinction.

A child, whose ideas of mountains may be derived from the table of comparative heights at the beginning of his atlas, in which the different summits are ranged in a row like so many sugar loaves, will simply take Mont Blanc to be a cone, of which the head happens to be four or five times taller than that of Snowdon. But sheer height is the very last thing which is perceptible in any upland region, except under very exceptional circumstances. Upwards of 15,000 feet of Mont Blanc, and nearly 15,000 of the Mischabel, indicate a vast and intricate region of ups and downs, clusters of peaks referable to the same base, valleys sloping away far out of sight, serpentine glens clogged up with torrent-like glaciers, and fenced by rifted

aiguilles, bristling heavenwards in savage prodigality, table-lands far above the snow level, and height upon height rising in complex augmentation each behind the other. Here is the secret. Upper mountain scenery is, by the nature of things, infinitely more complicated than that of regions whose highest peaks come below the snow line. The incidents of elevation, in the mountains of that country, are on such infinitely bigger and more intricate a scale, and the spectacle of range behind range presents itself under so undoubtedly grander an aspect, that comparison breaks down. Growing from the varying levels of rugged plateaus, and the frozen ice-streams, at all angles and all heights, crossing, overhanging, interlacing or underlying each other, are features so wholly foreign to Cumbria, or Wales, or even Scotland, that the comparison stultifies itself, in spite of Wordsworth's graceful argument about the fleecy clouds. In a word, his outburst is an excellent specimen of word-painting, but its value is not much as a canon of picturesque criticism. The result, so to speak, of comparative heights in Wales, Scotland, or Cumberland, is wholly made up of additions, for a difference of double or two-thirds is the utmost that can be predicated between the higher and more distinguishable heights in the same landscape. Upper mountain scenery calls in multiplication. In the Alps, with all the diminishing effects of distance and foreshortening, the broad fact remains behind, that one elevation may be, and often is, the multiple of another, the multiple being, of course, foreshortened behind the lesser height. But the inferior Skiddaw, Helvellyn, or Snowdon, is equally the victim of foreshortening behind the peaks which happen to occupy the foreground. Moreover, this proximate similarity of height checks the apparent infinitude of depth—range behind range—which can only find fair play under circumstances of great disparity of elevation. In one word, the excess of upper mountain, or Alpine over lower mountain, or Cumbrian measurement, and the existence on a gigantic scale of those striking natural phenomena, which owe their origin to congelation, are in themselves enough to justify the critics, who believe that they pay the best compliment to the sublimity of British mountains by not dragging them into contrast with the giants of continental Europe, and thereby setting up an impassable division between them and the bold hill scenery of many other regions of England.

We do not deny that there are many Alpine valleys in which the foreground conceals the loftier heights behind. Frequently too, when these elevations ought to be visible, the mountain fog blots them completely out of sight, and only leaves the lower peaks in sight. Then the landscape is reduced to the condition

of a lower mountain scene, and the points of superiority which the poet pleads for Cumbria may appropriately be admitted at their full value. The green meadows of Switzerland, and the trees in the valleys, walnut and plum, pear and apple, cultivated for their fruit-bearing qualities, must, in spite of the stateliness which the walnut so frequently attains, yield the palm of picturesque beauty to the heathery moor and the oak wood of the North. Autumn tints in Switzerland are, we believe, very rich, and the reddening leaf of the bilberry tones the scene. Still, the absence of summer heather (found, by the way, on the Italian side of the Alps) is a serious drawback. But, granting these limitations, the plain fact of the inherent superiority of Alpine scenery remains. Casual circumstances may equally elevate some effect of lower into a transitory equality with upper mountain scenery. An opportune snow storm may cap 'the mountain tops that freeze,' and then the tourist will do well to seize his advantage. Perhaps he may be even more daring, and imitate the clever, experienced mountaineers, who kept their Christmas gambols last year, (as registered in the *Saturday Review*,) by scrambling up snow-clad Snowdon, with rake handles by way of alpenstocks. The glowing description of their penman, written under the inspirations of fresh recollection, paints the spectacle which greeted them from the top of the wintry Welsh mountain, under the setting sun, as not inferior to several Continental panoramas of world-wide fame. We have no doubt that such was the case; but again, *exceptio probat regulam*, and although we hope that the example so given may swell the Christmas gains of landlords at Capel Curig and Grasmere, yet we cannot admit the casual grandeur of such an exceptional spectacle as overruling the plain facts of physical conformation. Though England may not possess its Alps, it owns richly, thanks alike to its physical and its political constitution, elements of rural and picturesque beauty in an abundance, which might well excite the envy of less happier lands. With what is confessedly our own let us continue to rest content.

ART. VII.—*Les Juifs en France, en Italie et en Espagne.* Par J. BÉDARIDE, bâtonnier de l'ordre des avocats à la cour impériale de Montpellier. Paris: Lévy Frères. 1859.

WE have long associated in our minds the idea that mediæval Spain was the home of true romance and chivalry: we have on the one hand the Christians doing glorious battle with the irresistible advance of the Mohammedan conqueror; on the other, we see the latter, in his turn, often manifesting a sense of honour and courtesy, which put to shame many a Christian knight. Besides these two, there comes between them a third, far too much overlooked in history, yet whose literary achievements ought to have placed him in a much higher rank than is ever accorded to him; to whom science and learning owe a debt, which they seem almost unwilling to pay,—we mean the Sephardim, or Spanish Jew, whose claims to the historian's notice have been overlooked or rudely thrust aside in favour of the other two, whom he so enriched, and who returned his benefits with such deep ingratitude. Spain, like Scotland, was once the land of the ballad and the song, which in long past days kept alive in that magnificent country the indomitable spirit of freedom, ever the most prized inheritance of the mountaineer. Who can read the glowing pages of 'The Cid,' or of Lockhart's 'Spanish Ballads,' even in their English dress, without being stirred to the very bottom of his soul? Who can listen to the legends of the Alhambra without revelling in imagination in all the glories of the sunny East? The very Arab conquerors caught something of the spirit of Christian chivalry; they even instituted orders of knights, they practised the tournament, they engaged in passages of arms, even with their Christian neighbours. Strange imitation! since there was ever lacking one thing, which constituted the very soul of Christian chivalry—the elevation of woman to her rightful position; a religion which degrades woman can never sustain real chivalry; and Moorish chivalry was at the best but a poor imitation of that native-born Christian institution.¹

¹ Let us say here, once for all, what is the meaning of the words 'Moor' and 'Arab?' The Arab conquered the whole of North Africa in the seventh century; the western part of Algeria, and what is now called Morocco, was then inhabited by the race of Mauritanians, or Mauri; from these came the word 'Moor,' still spelt in French 'Maure'; this is turned into the Spanish 'Moro' (as they have changed 'taurus' into 'toro,' and many other like words), from thence we get the word 'Moor.' The conquering Arab coming over to Spain from this country received

Besides this, the Spanish Moor achieved a further fame—he was an architect and a philosopher. From him the schoolmen got their Aristotle, and learned astrology, alchemy, and algebra. It is a curious question, and one well worth stopping to ask,—From whence did the Spanish Moor learn his science and his art? Why was it that the Spanish peninsula fostered a race of Ishmaelites so eminently superior to their brethren in other lands? The following pages will afford the true answer to these questions. At present, we shall only point out more strongly the singular fact of the isolation, as regards these matters, of the Spanish Moor. Separated by little more than twenty miles from the African coast, with which constant intercourse was kept up, there is no corresponding equality between the two members of the same race on the two opposite shores. We look in vain for learning between Tunis and Larache, such as Cordova or Granada afforded. No palace on the southern continent at all comes near the Alhambra of Granada, or the Alcazar of Sevilla; no mosque is to be for a moment compared

the name of the old inhabitant with whom the Spaniard has been so familiar. At the present day, the Arabs on the coast of Africa are still called by the French 'Les Maures,' while those in the interior are termed 'Les Arabes': the reason of this distinction is, that the Arabs expelled from Spain settled chiefly in the towns of the coast, principally for the purpose of trade; from their residence in Spain they were far more highly civilised than their African brethren, who were generally nomad tribes of Bedouins. The Kabails and Berbers are, however, the true 'Moors,' being descended from the ancient Mauri, though they never now bear that designation. These latter, though adopting the Mohammedan religion, retain many of their old customs; *e.g.*, there is far more equality between the sexes, the women (in the country) go unveiled, and work in the fields with the men; they live under independent chiefs, hardly owning the authority either of the Dey of Algiers, or, even now, of the Emperor of Morocco. It was these unfortunate wretches whom the French could not overcome in fair fighting; but, bent on entire conquest, proceeded to smoke them to death in the caves on Mount Atlas, where they had taken refuge. Of these also are the 'Riff pirates' of the present day, nominally subjects of the emperors of Morocco, but, in reality, independent.

The colour of the Moor is not black, as we have all learnt to suppose from 'Othello,' but in reality he is even fairer than the Spaniard: a young Moorish lady is as white and has as beautiful a bloom on her cheek as any lady in our own land. A black Othello is not, however, a mistake, since there were a great many negroes in the service of the Dey, chiefly slaves, but many freed men. No inconsiderable number of these were excellent sailors, powerful in body as well as bold and daring in action. The Arab or Moor is not, however, naturally a seaman nor a pirate: piracy was introduced into Africa by the Turk, who, up to the taking of Algeria, was the true corsair; the modern pirate, as we have said, is generally the Kabail or Berber. It is true that the Moor on his expulsion from Spain commenced a sort of petty piracy by capturing small Spanish trading vessels: but the true authors of Algerine piracy were the two brothers Aroudj and Khair-ed-Din, Turks by descent, natives of one of the islands of the Greek Archipelago, better known in European history as the brothers Barbarossa; the sepulchre of one of them is yet to be seen at Algier. A good account of these famous pirates will be found in *L'Algérie Ancienne et Moderne, par M. Leon Galibert*, Paris. It is amusing to see in this bulky volume, which is a really good history of Algier, French jealousy of England cropping out; for while the French conquest is blazoned forth with all *éclat*, Lord Exmouth's expedition, in 1816, only occupies one page.

to the Cathedral of Cordova, with its nineteen aisles, and eight hundred and thirty-four pillars; no mosque-tower like the Giralda of Sevilla, two hundred and fifty feet in height. On the contrary, the mosques and kasbahs of Morocco and Algier are generally poor things, those at Tangier especially so. The Kasbah of the Dey of Algier, and the Mosque at Tlemcen, are perhaps the finest of their respective kind, but they are very far behind their Spanish neighbours; even the houses in Andalusia are far superior to those in Africa, though both of them built after one fashion—the Moorish.¹

The solution of this enigma will be found, we think, in the fact, that there existed in Spain, long before the Moorish invasion, or even before the Gothic, large and powerful colonies of Jews, with schools and colleges superior to anything else in the Roman empire. They possessed a knowledge of astronomy, chemistry, and surgery, inherited from a long experience, which, if it had ever existed in the Roman empire, had been almost obliterated by the Northern invasions and conquests. We find, indeed, among the Jews generally, especially in Europe, a knowledge of drugs and medicines far exceeding that of the nations in which they were dispersed:² it was a knowledge often of immense value to the possessor, but often, too, the cause of frightful misery; for on the appearance of any contagious sickness, instead of calling in the aid of the Jew as a physician, when probably his skill and experience would have been of the greatest value, the populace, in almost every case, pursued exactly the contrary course; the universal voice clamoured for the expulsion of the physician for having caused the disease by poisoning the wells! And not content with mere expulsion, often were the miserable Jews murdered and plundered before they could effect their escape; as if the pouring out of their blood was to be a sort of libation to the demon of disease, to appease its wrath and obtain its removal. The immense wealth which the Jews accumulated by trade and usury, and which was imperceptibly enriching the

¹ The traveller will realize far more completely his dream of the 'East,' such as he learnt in childhood from the 'Arabian Nights,' by a visit to Southern Spain, than he will by one to Morocco, Algier, or Constantinople,—always excepting that he will not see the Oriental dress at the former, while he will at the latter; but the houses, with their marble floors and pillars, their fountains playing in the centre, their almost tropical plants, and the variegated lamps which hang from the galleries, create a charm, together with the unequalled climate, which realizes 'the East' far better than those places where the real Oriental is.

² It was no uncommon thing, as we shall show further on, for the court physician to be a Jew: one named Farragut was physician to Charlemagne. The same monarch employed another Jew, named Isaac, as an ambassador to the Khalif Haroun-al-Raschid; he returned with large presents, among which were an immense elephant and a clock.

country, was only another reason why they should be expelled. Rapacious rulers killed the goose, that they might get the golden eggs. While the Christian nations were engaged in ruinous wars or internal commotions, they had no time or opportunity to carry on trade; the Jew, taking no part in these quarrels, quietly got the greater part of commerce into his hands, and profited mightily. Covetous citizens and grasping nobles had no scruple in plundering the unbelieving Jew, the descendant of those who crucified their Lord; the bishops and clergy were not behind in fanning the flame of religious zeal to overwhelm the race which God had rejected and dispersed. When no epidemic was present to suggest the poisoning of wells, there was ever then the ready accusation that a Jew had murdered a Christian boy, to mix his blood in the Passover feast; or, out of pure spite, had crucified him, in imitation and mockery of the Christian's 'crucified God.'¹

¹ The beautiful 'Prioress' Tale' in Chaucer, and the touching story of Sir Hugh of Lincoln, will occur to the memory of some of our readers. An old Scotch ballad, relating to a somewhat like event, where the scene is laid in 'Merry-land,' is worth giving as a specimen of a very common belief of Jewish cruelty, though, we are confident, without foundation.

'The rain rins down through Merry-land Tounne,

Sae dois it downe the Pa :

Sae dois the lads of Merry-land tounne

Quhan they play at the ba'.

'Then out and cam the Jewis dochter
Said "Will ye cum in and dine?"

"I winnae cum in, I cannae cum in,
Without my play-feres nine."

'Scho pou'd an apple reid and white
To intice the zong thing in :

Scho pou'd an apple white and reid
And that the sweet bairne did win.

'And scho has taine out a little penknife
And low down by her gair,
Scho has twin'd the zong thing, and
his life ;

A word he never spak mair.

'And out and cam the thick, thick bluid,
And out and cam the thin,

And out & cam the bonny hert's bluid ;
There was nae life left in.

'Scho laid him on a dressing borde,
And drest him like a swine,

And laughing said, "Gae now and play
With your sweet play-feres nine."

'Scho row'd him in a cake of lead,
Bid him lie still and sleip.

Scho cast him in a deep draw-well,
Was fifty fadoms deip.

'Quhan bells wer rung, and mass was
sung,

And every lady went hame ;
Then ilka lady had her zong sonne,
But Lady Helen had nane.

'Scho row'd hir mantil hir about,
And sair sair gan she weip ;
And she ran into the Jewis castel,
Quhan they were all asleip.

"My bonny Sir Hew, my pretty Sir
Hew,

I pray thee to me speik."

"O Lady, rin to the deip draw-well
Gin ze your sonne wad seik."

'Lady Helen ran to the deip draw-well
And knelt upon her kne :

"My bonny Sir Hew, an ze be here,
I pray thee speik to me."

"The lead is wondrous heavy, mither,
The well is wondrous deip,

A keen pen-knife sticks in my hert ;
A word I dounae speik.

"Gae hame, gae hame, my mither deir,
Fetch me my winding sheet,

And at the back of Merry-land tounne
Its thair we twa sall meet."

In old Scotch, the letter 'x' is always pronounced soft, as a 'y'; it is so still in many proper names. We have said the scene of this ballad is laid abroad, since there never was any 'Jewry' in Scotland. Merry-land is probably Lombardy, in Dutch, Meylandt; the river Pa being the Po.

It is a matter well worthy of notice, that when all the nations of Europe occasionally persecuted and expelled the Jews, Rome alone never did either: the ghetto was always a safe asylum for the dispersed of Israel.

It was not, however, only trade and commerce that the Jews engaged in; they were, in early times, agriculturists, cultivating the lands of those countries where they had located themselves. This is proved from a law of Charlemagne, which forbids Jews, as well as Pagans, to grant long leases, or to assume a title for the possession of land.¹ Indeed, it seems probable that the early settlements of Jews, in the East, was as much for the purpose of carrying on their ancestral employment of husbandry as for trade; that they were perforce driven into the latter through the constant danger of expulsion—personal property being more easily moved than real. We find many laws passed forbidding Jews to possess Christian slaves, and many also prohibiting intermarriages with Jews—so many, indeed, that we cannot help coming to the conclusion that, through, probably, covetousness, caused by the wealth of the Jew, was the frequent incitement to contract these marriages, yet his status must have been, in these early times, far better than it became afterwards. The Church had evidently great difficulty in maintaining its prohibition on this point.²

It is chiefly from these royal laws, and from the decrees of ecclesiastical councils, that we learn both the condition of the Jews, and their number and status in the first ten centuries of the Christian era: we are by this means very early introduced to the knowledge of the importance and influence of the Jewish element in Spain, to which country we are now going to direct our principal attention. In the Council of Eliberis (Elvira, near Granada), A.D. 324, which seems to be the first *National* Council in that country, we find the following canons, Can. xvi., 'The daughters of Catholics shall not be given in marriage to heretics, unless these shall submit themselves to the Catholic Church; the same is also decreed of Jews and Schismatics: since there can be no communion of one that

¹ 'Non liceat Christianis Judæorum neque paganorum res emphyteosis, vel conductionis titulo habere, neque suorum similiter eis accommodare.'—Additio iii. cap. xv.

² 'Nulli Christianorum vel Judæorum liceat matrimonium contrahere, nisi premissa dotis promissione. Illud tamen observandum fore præcipimus ut si quis Christianus vel Christiana, aut Judæus vel Judæa nuptiale festum celebrare voluerint non aliter quam sacerdotali benedictione intra sinum sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ percepta, conjugium euiquam ex his adire permittimus. Quod si absque benedictione sacerdotis quisquam Christianorum vel Hebræorum conjugium duxerit; aut centum principi solidos exsolvat, aut centum verberatus publice flagella suscipiat.'—Ad. iv. cap. ii. Before the sacerdotal blessing could be given the Jew or Jewess must abjure Judaism.

'believeth with an infidel; and if parents transgress this command, they shall be excommunicated for five years.'

Can. xlix. 'Landholders are to be admonished not to suffer the fruits which they receive from God with the giving of thanks, to be blessed by the Jews, lest our benediction be rendered invalid and unprofitable. If any one should venture to do so after this interdiction, let him be altogether ejected from the Church.'

Can. l. 'If any person, whether clerical, or one of the faithful, shall take food with the Jews, he is to abstain from our communion, that he may learn to amend.'

Can. lxxviii. 'If any one of the faithful, having a wife, shall commit adultery with a Jewess, or a Pagan, he shall be cast out from our communion.'

From Can. xlix. we shall probably be safe in concluding that, in these early times, the Jews in Spain held a considerable amount of landed property. The blessing of the Jews refers to a very beautiful litany said by them on their New Year's Day (in March), called the 'Great Hosannah at the New Year.' The response to each petition being 'Hosannah,' or 'Save us, we beseech Thee.'¹

This council is the first authentic mention we have of the Jews; we say authentic, because, according to Jewish accounts, there have been settlements in Spain since the time of Solomon; a marble sarcophagus is reported to have been discovered at Murviedro, the ancient Saguntum, inclosing an embalmed corpse, with an inscription in Hebrew to the following effect:— 'The sepulchre of Adoniram, the servant of King Solomon, who came hither to collect the tribute.' Supposing this to be a genuine monument, it only proves that some of the servants of King Solomon had visited Spain, and that one of them died and was buried there; but it does not prove that there was any settled colony. We know that Solomon joined Hiram in naval enterprises, and that Tarshish² was one of the places of trade;

¹ We give the first petition as a specimen:—

'O God, we beseech Thee, open Thy good treasures from Thy dwelling-place; and may the earth give her verdure. Hosannah.'

Each of the fruits are separately mentioned in the subsequent petitions, and abundance of each separately prayed for.

² The position of Tarshish is a well-known matter of dispute, the most probable is that of Tartessus in Spain; the common objection to this is, that Solomon imported from it 'ivory, apes, and peacocks.' We do not think this fatal to the supposition, for if North Africa be included in the general term, the difficulty is much lessened; for certainly elephants abounded in the country north of the Atlas, as we learn from their use in the Punic wars; apes are yet found in great plenty; and if 'peacock' be a name loosely given to any beautiful and rare bird, we can suppose the Bird of Paradise to be included in the category—a bird which is still found in the country between Constantine and Tunis. If these African products were first imported by the Phœnicians from their settlements in Africa to Tartessus, and then exported from thence to Palestine, the Scripture account will then be consistent with itself.

we know also that the Phœnicians traded in Spain ; it is, therefore, quite possible that some Israelites visited Spain in these early times, but we cannot believe in Jewish colonies. We may be pretty certain that there were large settlements of Jews in Spain before the Christian era ; such an important trading place is not likely to have been overlooked.¹ S. Paul's anxiety to visit that country seems to favour the supposition : of authentic accounts we have none.²

In the beginning of the fifth century Spain was overrun by the Suevi, the Alani, and the Vandals ; the old inhabitants, Iberians, took refuge in the mountains of Biscay and the north. Soon after, the Alani and Vandals were driven over the Straits of Gibraltar by the Visi, or Western Goths, and founded the kingdoms in North Africa, and afterwards Theoderic expelled also the Suevi, and established the Gothic supremacy in Spain. We need not follow out the bloody controversy between the Arians and Catholics, which ended in the elevation of the Catholic king Recared to the throne of Spain, and the confirmation of the Catholic doctrine at the Third Council of Toledo, in 589 A.D., more than to say that we have again canons forbidding Christians to intermarry with Jews, and the latter to possess Christian slaves. What was the condition of the Jews during these wars we have no record, except that they were better treated by the Arians than by the Catholics : we only know that they rejoiced to see the breaking up of the Roman Empire, applying to it all the prophecies against Edom, believing, on the authority of the Talmud, that Rome is intended under that name ;³ and further, seeing that Rome was the metropolis of the Church, as Constantinople was of the empire, by a very easy transition they applied to the Church the prophecies against Edom. In something of the like manner the Arab of North Africa now applies the name 'Roumia' to all buildings and remains previous to his conquest of the country, by which he means, not Roman, in our sense of the word, but Christian.

After some years of civil war, in which two kings were killed, Sisebut assumed the regal power. He sent an embassy to Constantinople, concerning the possession of certain cities claimed

¹ That they were early acquainted with the riches of Spain, see 1 Mac. viii. 3.

² The document given by De Castro, as a letter from the synagogue of Toledo to Annas and Caiaphas, recommending them not to put our Lord to death, is a manifest forgery. It was produced in times of persecution, in the hope that by affirming that the Spanish Jews were not implicated in the condemnation and crucifixion of our Lord, they would be more leniently treated by Christians.

³ Benjamin of Tudela, in his Itinerary, thus speaks of Rome : 'The mighty Rome, which is the metropolis of the Edomites. About two hundred Jews reside in this city, honourable men, who pay no tribute to any power whatever. Several are in the service of Pope Alexander, who is a very great prince, and chief of the Edomitish religion.'

by the Emperor of the East. Heraclius was then on the throne, who had lately quelled one of the most savage rebellions of the Jews, in which the latter had destroyed, as they thought, every vestige of Christianity in Jerusalem; all the churches, including the beautiful one of S. Helena in the Holy Sepulchre, had been demolished, and some ninety thousand Christians had perished. The feelings of the emperor were far from friendly toward the followers of the Law of Moses; besides, being much addicted to the study of astrology, he had been informed by the professors of that art, that his dominions, and even the Church itself, were in danger from the *circumcised race*. 'This,' says Mariana, 'which he ought to have understood of the Arabs, he believed to denote the Jews; wherefore he commenced persecuting the Jews in every way, and by all the means in his power.'¹ At this moment the Spanish ambassador arrived; the emperor urged upon the latter to impress upon his sovereign the necessity of expelling the Jews from the peninsula. Sisebut was quite ready to comply; he issued an edict offering baptism or confiscation and exile, as the only alternatives for the race of Israel. This harsh decree was condemned at the time by S. Isidore, and even Mariana in his history declares such a proceeding to be 'unlawful and forbidden.' Ninety thousand converts are reported to have been made; the number of exiles we are not told. How little this availed we may learn from the fact that in less than twenty years after (A.D. 633), at the Council of Toledo, at which S. Isidore presided, no less than nine canons were enacted respecting the Jews; the first of them expresses disapprobation of forced conversions, but requires that such Jews as have received the sacrament shall continue in the belief and practice of Christianity.

We need not notice other councils; they all repeat the same style of canons, showing clearly how little effect all the forced conversions had on the faith of the Jew. One feature of the case we cannot pass over, for it is a striking instance of the invariable effect of persecution, whether in a good cause or a bad one; it is this, that numbers of Christians were continually embracing Judaism, both in France and Spain. Our author gives a curious instance in the former country:—

'Les conversions au Judaïsme n'étaient pas sans exemple. Plusieurs Chrétiens, parmi lesquels on citait un diacre du Palais, nommé Putho, avaient quitté l'Eglise pour embrasser le Judaïsme.'—P. 85.

The afflictions laid upon the Jews by these councils may be summed up thus: Jewish infants, at seven years old, to be taken away from their parents and educated as Christians; their

¹ Mariana. Libro Quinto, Capitulo III. Mohammed had then just commenced his mission.

heathen slaves to be emancipated by receiving baptism, and their wives divorced; Hebrew books to be destroyed; Hebrew festivals to be discontinued; circumcision prohibited; not allowed to hold public offices; their evidence not to be accepted in court; every Jew to be registered and inspected annually by the bishop; a sort of passport-system in case of travelling:—infraction of these rules to be punished by confiscation, with exile or death, unless the offender submitted to baptism. We may well inquire, How could Judaism continue to exist for the one hundred and twenty years of Catholic Gothic rule? Had the canons and laws really been carried out, existence as a separate people, with a distinctive religion, would have been impossible: we must, therefore, suppose that there were many priests, as well as many judges, who allowed the laws to lie unexecuted, and secretly connived at Jewish existence; probably Jewish gold will account for the fact still further. The time was, however, now at hand, when a complete deliverance from the Gothic yoke was to free the Jew from all religious persecution, and was to allow him to cultivate literature and learning till he far exceeded all Christian nations of the West; till Jewish Spain rivalled, if it did not surpass, that home which European literature yet found, when it had been expelled elsewhere by northern barbarism—Byzantium.

Before the end of the seventh century, about eighty years from the Hedjra, the Arabs had subdued the whole of North Africa; the Vandal kingdoms fell, and have not left a trace of Christianity behind them. In no country has Christianity been so obliterated as in the land famous for such names as S. Augustine and S. Cyprian. In no country have Christian monuments so universally disappeared.¹ In 710 the like fate seemed about to fall upon Spain: Taric, the Mohammedan leader under Musa, landed near Calpe, which he took, and named after himself, Ghebel-taric, the Mountain of Taric, now called Gibraltar. The Christian host under Roderic met the invaders on the plains of Jerez;² the battle lasted three days;

¹ Let it be remembered that the Vandals were Arians, and persecutors of the Catholics, and perhaps we may understand the moral of the Christian overthrow.

It is unaccountable that there are so few Christian remains in Algeria, when Roman (heathen) ones are numerous. There are the remains of a church and extensive Christian graveyard, extending over some acres of ground, at Tipassa, near Cherchell (the ancient Julia Casarea), which we think would well repay longer and closer investigation than we were able to give it when we visited the place. Tipassa is famous for the miracle of its forty martyrs—a miracle which even Gibbon admits as unassailable. Gibbon, *Hist.* ch. xxxvii. 4.

² We shall throughout this article adopt the modern Spanish orthography, as it is now authoritatively fixed. The letter *x* (equis) is now never used except in such words as are followed with a *c*, in which case it retains the sound of our English *x*. In all other cases, where it had the sound of an aspirated guttural, it is replaced by the letter *j* (jota). We have therefore written Jerez instead of the old Xerez.

on the third, the exhausted and almost conquered Saracens were rallied by their leader for one last effort; Taric himself fiercely charging reached the car of Roderic, and pierced him with his lance. This decided the day: most of the Gothic nobility having fallen as well as their king, the Christians fled on all sides, and the successful leader reduced town after town, in which he placed small garrisons of Arabs, supplementing them with Jews whom he found there. At Toledo the Jews opened the gates to the conqueror.¹ Soon was the whole of Spain overrun by the Arab invaders, till the Gothic inhabitants were forced to take refuge in the mountains of Asturias, as they had, years before, compelled the ancient inhabitants, the Iberians, to do in those of Biscay.

We are not, however, to suppose that all the Christians fled from the land now conquered by the Mohammedan; on the contrary, we find that large numbers remained, and were allowed full exercise of their religion. Mariana informs us that, at Cordova, 'the Moors at the conquest had granted full liberty to the Christian religion; and that, especially in that city, were to be seen publicly the priests, monks, nuns, in their several habits. Within the walls were the monasteries of Acisclus the Martyr, S. Zoylus, S. Faustus, S. Januarius, and S. Martial,' besides three churches; and without the walls were eight monasteries. He tells us also, that bells were allowed to be rung, and the exercise of religion not hindered, save that Christians were forbidden to enter the mosques, or to blaspheme their prophet.² In fact, from all that we can gather, we imagine that the Christians continued to be the majority of the inhabitants; they soon seem to have lost their own language, and to have spoken only Arabic;³ and so completely did they fall into Arab customs, that before long they practised circumcision, and abstained from pork and wine. These habits went on increasing, till at last, in after years, they entirely apostatized; for on the reconquest of Spain in the fifteenth century, there was not a

Even our old friend Don Quixote has undergone some transformation; he appears now as Don Quijote, pronounced Kehoté, the *j* pronounced as a guttural aspirate. *Ch* is sounded like the English; *z* (theta) like our *th*; *ll* and *ñ* have a liquid sound, as if followed by an *i*; and *g* is an aspirated guttural before *e* and *i*. The Spaniards confess that they have borrowed the sound of the jota from the Arabs.

¹ Roderic, Archbishop of Toledo, relates this fact: he adds further, '*Taric autem ex Arabibus quos secum duxerat, et Judæis quos Toleti invenerat, monivit Toletum.*' Again, '*Judæos autem qui inibi morabantur cum suis Arabibus ad populationem et custodiam Cordubæ demiserunt.*' Granada was committed to the Jews alone; on account of their number, it was called by the Arabs 'Jews' town.'

² Mariana. Libro Septimo, Capitulo XV.

³ Christians who talked only Arabic were called 'young Arabs; in Spanish, Mozarabians, from *Mozo*, a young man. Hence the 'Mozarabic Liturgy.' The Bible and the Book of Canons were also translated into Arabic for the use of the clergy, for few of them could understand Latin.

single Christian to be found in some of the larger cities. The same rule was applied to the Spanish Christians under Mohammedan rule as was, until the publishing of the Hattihoumayoun in Constantinople, in 1857, that in the whole Mohammedan empire, viz., Christians were governed by their own laws, under their own governors, who settled all internal disputes, and were permitted the exercise of their own religion; the Mohammedans not interfering unless the case concerned one of themselves.

We must now pause a moment in our history to inquire into the causes which brought the Arab host into Spain, for they are deeply connected with our subject. Ballads and romances have attributed the invasion to Count Julian, whose daughter King Roderic had seduced; and to revenge his dishonour the count invited the Moors to join him in a rebellion against the king. Whatever truth there may be in this story—and we are not disposed to question the existence of a substratum of truth—yet we cannot give it the importance its narrators claim for it; we shall find the true cause years further back, in the persecutions of the Jews.

Banishment or baptism being the two alternatives offered to the unfortunate sons of Israel, many chose the former; they passed over to the shores of Africa, and there prospered under Arab domination. Left at full liberty to exercise their religion, and to carry on trade, their condition naturally excited in the breasts of their less fortunate brethren a desire that such a happy condition might one day be theirs, even while living within the borders of Spain; for they clung to their adopted country with a like obstinacy, and almost a like affection, that their forefathers had to Palestine. They conceived, therefore, the idea of an Arab conquest to secure their own liberty, and to avenge themselves of their oppressors; offering to the latter the rich and magnificent plains of Andalusia and the gardens of Granada as their reward; nothing doubting that they who had so easily subdued the Vandal kingdoms of Africa, could, with equal facility, conquer also the Gothic kingdom of Spain. In confirmation of this statement we read that, sixteen years before the battle of Jerez, King Egica summoned the Seventeenth Council of Toledo, in which summons we find mention made that these Hebrews 'have plotted with others beyond the sea' to deliver up Catholic Spain to the infidel. This council, instead of relaxing the chains which other councils had forged for the unhappy Israelites, goes further, and offers only two alternatives—the acceptance of Christianity by the whole people, or a cutting them off by the 'scythe of justice.' They again decreed that all children of seven years old should be taken from their parents, brought up as Christians, and be married to

Christians; circumcision and Jewish observances again prohibited. This filled up the measure of Jewish endurance; renewed communications with their brethren in Africa, and through them with the Mohammedans, followed, and, when all was ripe, the Moorish host appeared, and Spain fell,—an event not only brought about in the first instance, but helped on in subsequent stages, by the Jews. That they were numerous there is no doubt; so numerous, that they were employed by the Arabs to garrison their captured towns. We may account for these large numbers—almost incredible, considering the constant persecutions—partly by supposing that the decrees were not fully carried out, in some cases through leniency, still more through the influence of Jewish bribes; and partly by supposing that the forced converts would, on the first appearance of victory, throw off their fictitious Christianity, and assume openly their secretly cherished Judaism. However it was, Taric found numerous and valuable allies in every town he besieged, and a ready-made garrison in every town he took. Generally the Jew used his newly-bestowed liberty with moderation and gratitude: in one instance, however, fanaticism got the better of prudence, and a certain Jew, named Serenus, proclaimed himself the Messiah, and called upon his countrymen to join his standard and restore the kingdom in the Holy Land. Numbers flocked to him, and, leaving all their possessions and their newly-acquired freedom, set sail under his guidance. What became of the enterprise is unknown, but we may conclude from the silence of history that it perished.¹ The great majority, on the other hand, used well the privileges allowed them by the Moors: not only did they enlarge their commerce, not only did they introduce improvements in agriculture, and especially in irrigation, so as to increase in Granada and Andalusia the riches of the soil, till they became like a vast garden; not only did they decorate their synagogues, and celebrate their feasts with blowing of trumpets and rejoicings, unknown for centuries under Gothic rule; but they now cultivated literature and learning, till their schools and their Rabbin became far more famous than those of older time at Tiberias and Babylon, and excelled the Christian universities of France and Italy. In truth, the Moorish domination of the Spanish peninsula was the Golden Age of Jewish learning; nor shall we be at all exaggerating if we affirm, that it was from the Jews that the Spanish Moors obtained their taste for literature; and that from their works,

¹ Besides this man there were several others, both in the East and West, who gave themselves out to be the Messiah; a brief notice of whom will be found in Baanage, liv. ix. ch. xi. Mr. Disraeli has made one, David Alroi, or Eldavid, A.D. 1200, a native of Persia, the hero of a novelette. Baanage tells us a curious story of an Arab of Fez, who proclaimed himself the precursor of the Messiah.

and in their schools, they learnt those accomplishments, and acquired that civilisation, which has ever made that marked contrast between the Arab of Spain and his brother of Africa.

In the middle of the tenth century, a persecution by the Khalif Kader broke up and dispersed the celebrated schools of Babylon: two Rabbin, Moseh and Hanoc, escaping the general wreck, found their way to Spain; and there, in 948, founded at Cordova a college, which was ere long destined to surpass its oriental parents, and fix its daughter schools in France and Italy, as well as in other places in Spain. In these, besides the exposition of the Scripture, treatises on the Talmud, researches in the Kabbala, we find there were taught medicine, astronomy, moral philosophy, as well as the lighter pursuits of music and poetry. The professors of Cordova obtained, we are told, by the unanimous voice of Europe, the title of 'Sapientissimi.' A writer in the fifteenth century ('Branch of David') affirms that every day from Cordova there rode out seven hundred Israelites in seven hundred chariots, all arrayed in royal apparel, and crowned with tiaras, after the custom of the Hagarene (Arab) nobles. Perhaps we must make allowance here for a little oriental exaggeration.

Even in the East, it would seem that the Arab was indebted to the Jew for an introduction to secular literature; for the early Mohammedan conquerors were too much taken up with warfare to attend to literature, and too fanatic to allow it to flourish. If the well-known saying of the Khalif Omar be true, which consigned to flames the celebrated library of Alexandria—that if the books were in accordance with the Khoran, they were useless; if contrary to it, were pernicious, and ought to be destroyed,—we shall see that learning had little chance of making progress. The Fatmahite Khalifs were persecutors of the Jews, so was Omar; but his successors were not: under the protection of the latter, the dispersed Rabbin of Sora and Pumbeditha resumed their teaching and their schools.

'We see them give themselves up to study with ardour, and open the career of the sciences to the Arabs. The first book written in Arabic was in fact the work of a Jew.

'Masser Javäich, a Syrian Jew, translated the Medical Pandects of Aaron, an Alexandrian priest, from Syrian into Arabic; and this work found numerous imitators.

'Following the example of the translator of Aaron, the Jews and Nestorians¹ of the school of Gondisapor set themselves to transport among the Arabs the rich heritage of Greek literature: the works of Hippocrates, Discorides, Plato,

¹ It is a singular feature in the history of the Jews, that while persecution was the general characteristic of the Catholics, the former lived in peace and harmony with heretics. Equally singular it is, that while the Orthodox Mohammedan (Sonnite) were their protectors, the Shiite of Persia and the sectarians of the west were persecutors.

Aristotle, succeeded the translation of Aaron; and, from that period, the Arabs, imbued with the taste for knowledge, prepared works which, several centuries later, contributed to make known in the West these luminaries.

'The establishment of the Arabs in Spain is one of the most important events which the history of the middle ages affords. We date from that time the commencement of a new era for the Jews, and a memorable one for learning. . . . This [patronage of learning] commenced under the dynasty of the Abassides.'—Pp. 66, 67.

With such ardour was literature pursued, that even the supposed inferiority of woman was overlooked; for while literary meetings were held in rose gardens, and beside fountains of water, where warriors recited their poetry, and students strove for prizes for eloquence, there was at Sevilla a college for women, from whence proceeded many whose name and fame posterity has preserved. Abderhahman had a female secretary named Moyna; Ayesha, noted for her beautiful handwriting, compiled books for her own and the khalif's library; and Waladata, daughter of the Khalif *ûl-Hakem*, has left behind her specimens of poetry, which prove that she was no mean proficient in the art. In this, as in other things, the Arab was preceded by the Jew, for we read of a daughter of the Prince of the Captivity giving public lectures on the Talmud; and, fearing that her beauty might inspire other feelings than the love of knowledge, she delivered her lectures sitting behind a lattice.

Again:—

'The Jews in France and Italy were not slow to avail themselves of the literary riches of those in Spain; the study of medicine was established among them, as among the Spanish Jews; and afterwards, in the ninth century, the principal physicians of France and Italy were Jews.'—P. 95.

In France, the schools of Narbonne and Lunel were the most famous; there were others at Beziers and Montpellier; in Italy, that of Salerno stands first. Montpellier became afterwards the most celebrated of all the schools of France for medicine. Though the language used in these schools was principally Hebrew, and the scholars Jews, we find occasionally a Christian pupil in those of Spain; we may mention particularly Gerbert, Archbishop of Rheims, then of Ravenna, who was afterwards elected Pope, under the name of Sylvester II.; for his scientific knowledge was so far in advance of the age, that he did not escape from the suspicion of magic.¹

This superior learning of the Jews, as well as their administrative abilities, raised them to high offices in the courts of the

¹ Some of our readers will be, perhaps, surprised to learn, that there once existed a Jewish school, synagogue, and burial-place at Oxford; whether the former was attached to the University or not is not clear: the buildings were removed by Cardinal Wolsey to make room for Christ Church; the cemetery is included in the grounds of the Botanical Gardens. See *Ant. à Wood*, '*Hist. Oxon.*' vol. II. pt. ii. p. 745.

Khalifs of the West. It was through Bar-Khasdai,¹ the confidential adviser to Abderhahman, and Ben Isaac Israeli, a famous physician, that the Jews obtained so many privileges: even the Christian kings of Spain forgot the persecuting decrees of their predecessors, and admitted Jews to high offices in the state, that of royal physician being generally one.

We even find Alfonso VIII., surnamed 'the Good,' granting to Jews in the Charter of Cuenca the rights of citizenship, putting them on an equality with Christians. This favour, which was really owing to the king's respect for the superior learning and talents of the Jews, gave rise to a discreditable story, that he was influenced by an unlawful affection for a beautiful Jewess, who, like Esther, procured favour for her people. S. Ferdinand, of Castilla, was the king who did most for the Israelites. When he had conquered the greater part of Andalusia, he allowed the Rabbin of Cordova to transfer themselves and their college to Toledo, as being a more central position from which might flow more easily the stream of learning to other places. When his son, Alfonso X., surnamed 'the Learned,' composed his astronomical books, known as the 'Alfonsine Tables,' two Jews of Cordova, as well as fifty others, brought at high salaries from the Jewish schools in France, assisted the learned Moors in composing the work.

We noticed the curious fact that, during the severe persecutions of the Jews, many Christians judaized; we find the equally unexpected fact that, in the Golden Age of Jewish learning and toleration, several eminent, and many ordinary Jews became, of their own free will, Christians. Among the former was Moses Tsadik, who, on his baptism at Husca, A.D. 1106, received the name of Peter Alonso, the king, Alonso I., standing his godfather. He wrote a learned treatise against Judaism, and another against Mohammedanism—works which are said to have much encouraged conversions from these two bodies. The celebrated commentator, Nicholas de Lyra, was a converted Jew; we find others mentioned, whose learning gained them promotion to bishoprics, both in Spain and Italy.

We could easily fill up the remaining space of this article

¹ It is from an embassy sent to Constantinople by this minister, that we learn the fact of the existence of the curious kingdom of Kosar, the head of which was always a king professing Judaism, though not always a Jew by descent. The history of the establishment of Judaism as the national religion is curious: a certain ruler, finding his dominions containing Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, in nearly equal proportions, secretly asked the former if Judaism were not better than Mohammedanism? they replied it was. Asking the like question of the Mohammedans, viz. if Judaism was not better than Christianity, and receiving also an answer in the affirmative, he concluded, with something like a mathematical calculation, the superiority of Judaism. Basnage doubts the existence of this kingdom, but subsequent discovery has established its certainty.

with lists of the names and works of Jewish authors, were such a catalogue consistent with our plan; a tolerably good *resumé* of these will be found by the curious in the work we have placed at the head of this article, also in Mr. Finn's 'Sephardim.' There are a few names, however, which we must not pass over; most of them will be familiar to those acquainted with Bishop Patrick's Commentary, Leigh's *Critica Sacra*, or Lightfoot's works. R. Solomon Jarkhi, called also Rashi,¹ is styled among his countrymen the *Prince of Commentators* (twelfth cent.); he visited his countrymen in Europe and Asia, even as far as Russia and Tartary, where he collected every kind of Rabbinical lore. Abraham Aben Ezra, surnamed *the Wise*, was a writer on astronomy, philosophy, medicine, poetry, and grammar, besides being a commentator on Scripture. His commentary on the Book of Job is particularly valuable on account of his knowledge of Arabic. He takes the Arabic translation of R. Saadias, surnamed *Gaon* (the excellent), master of the Babylonian schools in the seventh century, as his text. It was Aben Ezra who first divided the globe into two hemispheres by inventing the equator. We see from this that the true theory of the earth was known to the Jewish Rabbin long before the time of Galileo; probably the true knowledge had never been lost. 'In the Book of *Chamouna the Aged*, i.e. in the Book of *Zohar*,' writes M. Frank,² 'we learn from frequent explanations, that the earth turns round itself in a circle; that one portion of the inhabitants are on the upper surface, the other is on the under; that all creatures change the point of sight, according to the aspect of each place, though keeping throughout the same position; that while one country of the earth is enlightened, there are others in darkness: to the one is day, to the other night; and there are lands where it is constantly day, or at least the night continues but a few moments.'

We shall hardly be making a rash conjecture when we say that this knowledge mounted up far beyond the time of the author of the Book of *Zohar*, for it may be found in Job (xxvi. 7): 'He hangeth the earth upon nothing.' Like others of the Rabbin, he relieved the weariness of study by the lighter literature of poetry, and also by the intellectual amusement of chess. Aben Ezra combined these two together; he wrote a poem on chess, in which the game is played out in rhymes, moral reflections frequently attending each move. On *check-mate* we have the following: 'For his [the king's] sake all

¹ The Jews gave abbreviated names to the great Rabbin by taking the first letters of their names, interposing vowels, thus forming a word: here *R* stands for Rabbi, *S*, or *Sh*, for Solomon, and *J* for Jarkhi.

² De la Cabale. The book of *Zohar* was written in the first century.

' the troops are slain, and the redemption of his life is equivalent to theirs, the glory is gone, and they are no more his subjects, for their lord is slain; but, nevertheless, they may fight another battle, and those who are slain may be revived.' He also wrote some kabbalistic works. He died about A.D. 1174. Chess was a favourite game both with Arabs and Jews, both of whom have left works on the subject both in Hebrew and Arabic. Draughts are constantly played in the cafés in Algier to this day.

Three Kimkhi, father and two sons, all learned writers, of whom David is the most celebrated (called Radakh), born at Narbonne, which then belonged to Spain: he is well known as a commentator, especially on the Psalms and Isaiah. He is, perhaps, the first who introduced criticism into a Biblical commentary. He flourished at the end of the twelfth century. R. Moses Bar Nachman (called Ramban), born about the same time, was a devoted student in Kabbalism; his commentaries are consequently chiefly allegorical. R. Levi Ben Gersom, called Ralbag, a physician by profession, wrote also commentaries; unlike the former, his expositions are literal rather than allegorical: he died A.D. 1370. R. Isaac Abarbanel, born at Lisbon, A.D. 1437, received the rank of *Don* from Alfonso V. of Portugal; he was, however, obliged to fly from the persecutions of the successor of his patron, and died at Venice. He, too, has left valuable commentaries.¹

We have deviated a little from chronological order, in not having mentioned sooner the great Maimonides: we have done so, because we intend to give him a longer notice. R. Moses Ben Maimon (called Rambam) is sometimes mentioned as Moses the Egyptian, on account of his long residence in that country; he was, however, born at Cordova, in A.D. 1131. He claims a long line of illustrious ancestors, being descended from R. Jehudah Hakkodosh (the Holy), the compiler of the Mishnah, and therefore of the royal line of David. Instructed by his father in Scriptural and Talmudical lore, he added also a large amount of Gentile learning, being familiar with the writings of Plato, Aristotle, Themistius, Galen, and other philosophic and medical works, especially the latter. His disinterested friendship for the illustrious Arabian, Averroë, caused his exile from his native country; for Averroë was accused of defection from the Mohammedan faith, and was consequently deposed from his office of chief magistrate at Cordova. Maimonides was suspected of a leaning toward the doctrines of Islam—a groundless suspicion, founded on his friendship for Averroë—and had to fly from

¹ Most of the commentaries mentioned above will be found accompanying the great Bibles published by Bomberg and Buxtorf.

the persecution of his own countrymen. He came to Cairo, where he was made court physician to Alphardel, the Khalif. In a letter to R. Samuel Aben Tybbon, he thus describes his daily life:—‘I generally visit the sultan [khalif] every morning; and when either he, or his children, or his wives, are attacked with any disorder, I am detained in attendance the whole day; or when any of the nobility are sick, I am ordered to visit them. But, if nothing prevent, I repair to my own habitation at noon; where I no sooner arrive, exhausted and faint with hunger, than I find myself surrounded with a crowd of Jews and Gentiles, nobles and peasants, judges and tax-gatherers, friends and enemies, eagerly expecting the time of my return. Alighting from my horse, I wash my hands, according to custom; and then, courteously and respectfully saluting my guests, entreat them to wait with patience while I take some refreshment. Dinner concluded, I hasten to inquire into their various complaints, and to prescribe for them the necessary medicines. Such is the business of every day. Frequently, indeed, it happens that some are obliged to wait till evening; and I continue for many hours, and even to a late hour of the night, incessantly engaged in listening, talking, ordering, and prescribing, till I am so overpowered with fatigue and sleep that I can scarcely utter a word.’¹

By his influence with the khalif, he was allowed to found an academy at Alexandria, which soon became famous, drawing students from Egypt, Syria, and other parts of the East. This school was afterwards broken up by the fanaticism of the Mohammedans, who compelled many Jews to apostatise.

His great fame rests upon his writings on the Mosaic Law and the Talmud. In the latter, he distinguishes between the decisions of the judges and the legends or stories which illustrate the law of the judgments—a distinction of immense importance at the time, as the two matters being confused together in the Talmud, there was a tendency to make them of equal authority; thus, as it were, setting the seal of authority on the wildest extravagancies of Oriental imagination. This work is called *Jad Hak hazakah*, ‘The Strong Hand;’ or *Mishneh Torah*, ‘The Mishnical Law.’ The other work, still more celebrated, is the *More Nevochim*, ‘Ductor dubitantium;’ it is a critical, philosophical, and theological work, in which are explained the ceremonies, parables, allegories, and difficult passages in the Old Testament. It is his last work—excepting his transcription of the Pentateuch—written, in Arabic, when he was fifty years

¹ See a translation of a portion of the *More Nevochim*, by Lr. Townley. London, Longman, 1827. To which is prefixed some valuable dissertations, and a life of Maimonides.

of age. It was afterwards translated by his pupil, Aben Tybbon, under his own eye, into Hebrew. This book threw the world of Jewish Rabbin into consternation, and divided it into two parties, one which made no distinction between the authority of the legends and judgments in the Talmud, and the other which followed the distinction made by Maïmonides. The question came to an issue at Montpellier, where R. Solomon, then president of the schools, with other Rabbin, violently opposed the principles of the book, and declared its author excommunicate. The synagogue of Narbonne replied by anathematising R. Solomon. To settle the question, R. David Kimkhi was sent to consult the synagogues of Spain; which, taking part against Solomon, established the authority of Maïmonides. The dispute was not finally settled till 1232.¹

His last work was the transcription of the Pentateuch, with his own hand, from a copy written before the destruction of Jerusalem, in order to preserve the true version from the many corruptions which disfigured the copies then in use. It is also said that he visited Chalons, in Burgundy, where he obtained a copy written by the hand of Ezra, which he found to agree with his own in every particular. He died in 1205, aged seventy; a fast of seven days was proclaimed in the synagogues—in which even the Mohammedans joined—where 1 Sam. iv. 1, to the words 'the ark of the Lord is taken,' was appointed to be read; he was buried at Tiberias, some say Hebron. The admirers of this great man may perhaps be pardoned, if they, like their Christian contemporaries, relate some miraculous events which attended his death. The funeral procession, we are told, was attacked by robbers, and dispersed; when the latter were about to throw the coffin into the sea, it was found immovably fixed to the ground, and so remained until the return of the bearers, who then were enabled to commit the remains of the great Rabbi to his last resting-place. Maïmonides, to this day, holds a place in the estimation of the Jew above all other Rabbinical writers. 'From Moses to Moses there never has arisen one like unto Moses,' is become a proverb.

We must not pass over another remarkable character, Benjamin of Tudela, the famous traveller. Setting out from Navarre in 1160, he visited the principal places in Europe, Asia, and Africa, where his own countrymen were chiefly located. At

¹ A sect of Karaites arose in Spain, partly in consequence of Maïmonides having thus shaken the faith of many in tradition. Aben-Alphraz was their principal defender; their great opponent was Abraham Ben David Halevi, who obtained from King Alfonso a decree against the anti-traditionists, with complete success, for the latter were silenced; the dispute and victory of the Talmudists caused a still stronger enthusiasm in favour of tradition, which in a great measure neutralized the good that Maïmonides had done.

each place he notes down the number and condition of the Jews whom he found there; and so long as he relates what he himself saw and observed, we believe him trustworthy; further than this we cannot go. Credulous to the last degree, he records all that was told him, and accepts all legends as true; in this matter it is not impossible for us to make a pretty accurate distinction between the legend and the history; *e. g.*, in speaking of Kharran, he says,—‘Which place was indeed the home of our father Abraham, but no edifice now remains. . . . Twenty miles from Babylon reside twenty thousand Jews, who worship in synagogues, or in that high chamber, which Daniel the prophet built for himself of hewn stones and brick; there is also a synagogue and the palace of Nebuchadnezzar, and the furnace into which were cast Ananias, Misael, and Azarias.’ Here we may fully believe that these places were shown to Benjamin, and that those that showed them believed that they were the places which they described; but we may safely doubt that fact of Daniel having built the identical chamber, or that the palace of Nebuchadnezzar and the fiery furnace had escaped the general ruin of Babylon. When, too, he records statements of the wealth and greatness of Jews in other countries than those he visited, and wonderful tales of Gentile nations whom he never saw, we must be permitted to consign such to the like category in which we place those marvels of our own countryman, Sir John Mandeville. It is on account of these fabulous stories that Dr. E. Clarke and the cautious Basnage have expressed their belief that Benjamin had never quitted his native country. We see no sufficient ground for supposing him to have been an impostor, or to have deliberately written fiction; for without doubt the Jews were the greatest travellers of those times—they visited their own countrymen in every land. On the authority of Benjamin, we find that a person calling himself the Prince of the Captivity yet lingered at Babylon, where the fame of its former glory had not died away; and many of the Western Jews were anxious to visit the country so famous for learning, the residence of the (supposed) last prince of the house of David, and the birthplace of the Talmud, and the cradle of learning. We only regret that more of those pilgrims did not record what they saw and heard.

We remarked above, that, during the Golden Age of Jewish learning and wealth, when Christian monarchs were too weak, or perhaps too prudent, to put in force the sanguinary decrees of their predecessors, or of the ecclesiastical councils, many Jews were converted to Christianity. One in particular deserves a passing notice, not only on account of his own learning and eloquence, but on account of his great success in converting others of his

own countrymen. This was Joshua Lorki, who, on his baptism, took the name of Jeronimo de Santa Fé. His conversion and success so exasperated the unbelieving Jews, that they, making a word out of the initials of his name, called him Halorki, the Blasphemer. Pedro de Luna, the Spanish anti-pope (Benedict XIII.), whose physician he was, desiring at once to hear Jeronimo, and, if possible, to make a large number of converts, invited the most eminent Jews to a public disputation, in which Jeronimo undertook to prove from the Talmud that the Messiah had come. The disputation commenced February 7, 1413, and lasted till November of the following year, the anti-pope presiding, either in person or by deputy. The discussion was carried on in Latin, and the Jews seem to have been treated with perfect fairness, and the disputation conducted with impartiality. The result was that all the Jews who had disputed against Jeronimo, excepting two, confessed themselves to be conquered in the contest, and embraced Christianity. These were followed by about fifteen hundred more, who acted on the example of their Rabbi. The victors sullied their triumph by issuing decrees in the spirit of the old Spanish Councils of Toledo, whereby thousands were compelled to be baptized.¹

We may also mention another learned Jew who was converted to the Christian faith, Solomon Halevi; he is said to have been convinced by the reading of the treatise '*De legibus*,' by S. Thomas Aquinas. He took holy orders, and was successively Bishop of Cartagena, and Archbishop of Toledo; he, too, was instrumental in convincing many Jews and Moors, and drawing them into the Church.

The period of Jewish liberty was now fast passing away; the arms of the Christians were slowly gaining ground, and surrounding the one remaining Moorish kingdom of Granada: with the reconquest of Spain came the reimposition of persecuting statutes. These were imposed only by degrees, for we find even as late as 1474 the assessment of the kingdom of Castilla in the hands of a Jew, Jacob Aben Muñez, King Henry IV.'s physician and chief judge, while many of the proscribed nation held important offices in the state. War had exhausted not only the exchequer of the king, but the means of the peasant; commerce among the Spaniards there was scarcely any, agriculture was neglected, and there was little gold or silver current in the country, for America had not yet poured in her unbounded wealth on the fortunate discoverer; in fact, most

¹ We are well aware that Jews have given a different version of this famous disputation; they attribute the conversions to the decrees of the council, not to the eloquence of Jeronimo. We have followed De Castro's account, and as he quotes authentic documents, we see no reason to discredit him.

of the gold and silver was in the hands of the Jews, and they durst only use it by stealth, for fear of being plundered by the people. Even the Moorish kingdom was imitating the Christian ones in oppressing the Jew, and depriving him of the liberty he formerly possessed. Portugal alone granted them full liberty, which lasted until the end of the fifteenth century, during which time the celebrated Abarbanel held the office of minister of finance. Many Jews emigrated from Spain to the former country, where Raban Eliezer established printing presses, from which issued an abundance of works in Hebrew, among which was an edition of the Pentateuch with the Chaldee paraphrase, and the Commentary of Rashi. The typography is beautiful.

We must now hasten to a close: Ferdinand and Isabella, having united the Spanish Christian kingdoms under one crown, determined on expelling from Spain the last remnant of Moorish dominion. Granada fell, and the last king, Abd-Allah, or, as he is commonly called, Boabdil,¹ with the remains of his shattered army, was fain to seek refuge in the country,² from whence his victorious ancestors had issued seven centuries before, and won from the ancestors of his conquerors a land in which, to this day, the traveller sees unmistakable traces of the once dominant race, not only in the architecture of the country, but in the manners, habits, dress, and countenances of the inhabitants of Southern Spain:³ in no European country is there such a large mixture of Semetic blood. With the conquest of Moorish Spain came the Inquisition, in order to reduce to the Catholic faith every inhabitant of that country; the well-known names of the great statesman Cardinal Jimenes, and the equally famous, or perhaps infamous, inquisitor, Torquemada, now appear on every page of the histories of those times; no period that went before

¹ The tomb of Boabdil has been lately identified at Tlemcen.

² It is a curious fact that the Spanish Moors were far from being welcomed back by their African brethren, they were rather looked upon as an alien race; perhaps this fact, as well as their desire to revenge themselves on the Spaniard, induced them to take up piracy as a profession, which the advent of the two Barbarossa elaborated into a permanent institution.

³ Pure Gothic blood, so much prized by the Spanish hidalgo, hardly exists except in the mountains of the Asturias and of Navarre. The Christians living under Arab rule adopted the language and habits of their conquerors, so that they seem almost to have lost Spanish nationality, as well as Christianity; intermarriages were so frequent, that their children were popularly known as Mozarabians (young Arabs): besides this, in the compulsory conversion of the Jews, the youth of the latter, of both sexes, were received into the most noble families, who acted as god-parents, and were permitted to intermarry with other noble families, as if they had been real, and not adopted, children only. A story is told of the Marquis of Pombal, who, when king Joseph I. of Portugal issued a command that all Jews, and those who had Jewish blood in their veins, should wear a yellow hat, appeared in court with three hats of that colour; on being demanded of the king for whom these hats were intended, he replied, that one was for himself, another for the king, the other for the grand inquisitor, all of whom had Jewish blood in their veins.

equalled the persecutions that the Jews suffered under the unrelenting Inquisition. Llorente, in his *History of the Inquisition*, tells us that while Torquemada held chief office ten thousand two hundred and seventy Jews were burnt; six thousand eight hundred burnt in effigy; and ninety-seven thousand three hundred and twenty-one marked with infamy. The ruin of the Jew was, at that time, the destruction of commerce; war had desolated the fair and rich provinces formerly held by the Moors, and had destroyed the system of irrigation introduced by the latter,—a system, which caused that bounteous land to yield a hundred fold to the diligent husbandman. Now every source of wealth was dried up, and Spain, even with her splendid reconquest, would have sunk far below the lowest of European kingdoms, had not the discoveries of Christovallo Colonna opened out the boundless wealth of the new world to that exhausted country. There can be no doubt that one great cause of the Jewish persecution was to recruit the royal coffers with gold; to make the descendants of the crucifiers of the Son of God pay for the crusades of the Catholic Spaniard against the infidel was only in the eyes of the men of those days but an act of simple justice; so far was this general extortion carried, that we find the Inquisition sparing neither converts, nor unbelieving Jews; all who were possessed of wealth were accused of the crime of Judaizing, and sentenced to death or infamy; so barefaced was this system, that we actually have a Brief of Pope Sixtus IV. dated January, 1481, despatched to Ferdinand and Isabella, complaining of the acts of two Inquisitors, Morillo and San Martin, for persecuting persons who were real Catholics, declaring them to be heretics, and condemning them to death, in order to get possession of their property. The Brief ends with saying that these two inquisitors deserve punishment and forfeiture of their office. The Brief was without effect; for we read afterwards that the exigencies of the state proved stronger than zeal for the Catholic faith, for thousands of baptized Jews were permitted to Judaize in secret on payment of a large sum of money in lieu of Christianity. But the living did not prove sufficient to satisfy the king's demands, or the necessities of the State; legal proceedings were instituted against converted Jews who were then dead, and had been rich. These were solemnly arraigned before the Inquisition, where they were, of course, found guilty of Judaizing; upon which their property, or rather that of their heirs, was confiscated, and deposited in the royal treasury, while their bodies were disinterred and committed to the flames. Yet even all these efforts, which we shou'd think would have entirely rooted out Judaism from Spain, really failed

to do so. The people of Israel clung to Spanish soil with an unequalled obstinacy; rather than quit it they dissembled, they pretended to adopt Christianity, and, under that pretence, they rose to high offices in Church and State: we find secret Jews who held Government offices, even bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical posts; nay, we find some in the ranks of the Inquisition itself.

These troublous times did not quench the love of literature among the learned. Holland afforded a safe asylum from persecution, and a home for learning; from thence it spread through Germany, where it revenged itself on the Christian persecutions it suffered in Spain by imbuing the Christian intellect with infidel philosophy. Baruch Spinoza, the father of modern Pantheism, was the son of a family of expelled Spanish Jews; and most of the rationalistic writers are countrymen of his, as well as followers of his philosophy.¹ R. Solomon Ben Virga, in his 'Sceptre of Judah,' has written an interesting history of the fortunes of his people since the destruction of the second temple. Religious, astronomical, and medical works, still continued to appear as in the Golden Age of Jewish prosperity; nor was the spirit of poetry, or of fiction, dead. R. Berachiah published a collection of fables taken from those of Æsop and Phædrus, many of which he remodeled, adding others drawn from the Talmud. It is from him that La Fontaine compiled his collection.

Spanish literature is largely indebted to the Talmud and to Jewish writers, for much that we give the Spaniard credit for; many, perhaps the greater number of, proverbs which filled the mouth of Sancho Panza and the Spaniard of the present day, derive their origin from this source. The celebrated cases brought before the famous Governor of the Island of Barataria, together with that sapient person's decisions, are all extracted from the Talmud.

We do not intend to harrow the feelings of our readers with details of the proceedings of the Inquisition; it is enough to say that all the old stories of Jews crucifying children, murdering them to obtain their blood for their Passover feasts, of their stealing the consecrated host, and stabbing it with knives till it bled, of magic and witchcraft, were all revived in their most savage form: strange, we hear nothing of any of these charges while the Jews were at liberty, and could have perpetrated such deeds almost with impunity—it is sufficient to say that every possible indignity and persecution, which religious hatred and human covetousness could devise, was tried upon them, till at length

¹ See some remarks on this in an article in Dr. Wolff, *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xli. A good sketch of the life of Spinoza is given in 'A Biographical History of Philosophy,' by G. H. Lewes, vol. iii. Knight's Series.

residence in Spain became impossible. A decree was issued ordering them to turn Christians or to leave the country; in case of disobedience, death was to follow. Such brief space of time was allowed, that they had no opportunity even to dispose of their immovable property. Purchasers took such advantage of this decree, that the unfortunate Israelites were obliged to conclude the most ruinous bargains, so that, according to Bernaldez, 'they would barter a house for an ass, and a vineyard for a garment.' Portugal still offered something like an asylum, for these fearful decrees were not yet issued there; accordingly, we read from the same authority, that, in 1492, one hundred and sixty thousand families voluntary exiled themselves,¹ of whom one hundred and eighty-three found refuge in Portugal: from whence, however, they were afterwards exiled. Some of the expelled went to France and Flanders; but the majority emigrated to Constantinople, and other places in the Turkish Empire, and to Algier and Morocco, where, to this day, they speak among themselves the Spanish tongue.² Terrible were the sufferings of those exiles; some embarked in Moorish vessels, where these pirates plundered them of their goods, then landed them naked and without food on some barren place on the coast of North Africa; stress of weather drove some back to Spanish ports, where, unable any longer to endure their sufferings, they applied for Christian baptism, that they might remain in their beloved land. After six months' sojourn in Portugal, the king, imitating the conduct of Ferdinand, and commencing to practise extortions, the miserable remnant of Israel embarked for Morocco, and formed a sort of camp at Arcilla, with the intention to proceed to Fez. Hearing of the plundering propensities of the Moors, they asked leave to return to Spain, where they purchased rest at the expense of their religion.³

¹ Zurita says four hundred thousand, and Mariana eight hundred thousand persons.

² Those who have visited the bazaars in Constantinople will remember the number of boys who are ever ready to act as interpreters in making bargains with Turkish merchants; nearly all of these are descendants of Spanish Jews. It is perhaps also a remnant of Spanish nationality, that in Algier Jewish shops are shut on Sunday morning, as well as their own sabbath; indeed, the unbelieving Jew observes the Sunday better than the Christian Frenchman.

³ Dent. xxviii. 64, &c. will occur to the recollection of most of our readers; it is impossible for any description to express more clearly than this prophecy, delivered nearly three thousand years before, the miserable condition of dispersed Israel: 'And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other . . . and among these nations thou shalt find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest; but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee, and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life: in the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see.'

We are, perhaps, at first surprised to find the Moors, who had so long protected the Jews, now turned persecutors. They had been so for some time; persecution commenced before the breaking up of the kingdom of Granada, partly from the imprudence of the Jews themselves—some of the more zealous attempting to make converts of the Moors;—and partly from the advent of the Almohad—a fanatical sect, very numerous in Morocco,—who had been invited over to Spain to support the tottering power of the Khalifs. This sect, for some cause or other, was hostile to the Jews, and persecuted them both in Granada, and afterwards when they took refuge in Morocco. When the Turks took possession of Algier, the sufferings of the Jew recommenced; the barbarian Dey would appease his clamorous soldiers, and wipe off the arrears of pay, by granting them permission to plunder the Jews in the bazaars and shops. Perhaps the Jew is the only person in Algeria who is really benefited by the taking of that country by the French; he now stands on an equality with his former oppressor, though still subject to occasional outbursts of fanaticism.¹

Spain has paid dearly for its cruelty toward these children of her soil. For a short time she stood at the top of European greatness; her colonies, seizing upon the virgin wealth of the New World, poured into their mother's lap riches hitherto undreamt of; but the same selfish policy which expelled the Jews in order to appropriate their wealth, has alienated from her those once flourishing colonies, and stript her bare. The Church, too, which shared in, and generally incited, the State persecutions, has had her judgment also, as every traveller in Spain well knows, who has seen the number of ruined monasteries and convents throughout the whole country: the Church which helped the king to plunder the Jews has itself been plundered of its landed property to meet the exigencies of government; its ministers are but stipendiaries of the State. The Inquisition, that mighty engine to produce uniformity to the Catholic faith, by compelling all Jews and Moors to become Christians, became itself an insupportable burden, which was at last cast off. It has, however, left its indelible mark on the cramped and narrow mind of the Spaniard of to-day. With a country of boundless fertility, with mines of inexhaustible wealth, with every facility for commerce, the spirit of enterprise is wholly wanting, a dead

¹ On a Sunday morning, in April, 1859, as the English residents were proceeding to church, they found the street crowded with French and Arabs in a state of great excitement; on asking the cause, we received for answer, 'Une chase des Juifs.' It afterwards was ascertained that the barbarian Turcos, who were then embarking for the Italian war, having some old grudge against the Jews, proceeded to wreak their hatred upon every Jew they saw; three were killed that morning.

level of mediocrity everywhere prevails; and a country, which is intended by nature, and by its position, to stand first among European kingdoms, has degraded itself below many which have not half its advantages.

Though we do not agree with Mr. Buckle in his narrow philosophy, his anti-Christian prejudices, and his intolerable self-sufficiency, yet we cannot deny that there is a great deal of truth in his account of Spanish civilization, both in its present character and in its more remote causes. The whole history of that country is a saddening picture of the evil effects of perverting religion, and its exponent, the Church, to be an engine for temporal purposes, and to procure its great intentions, not by convincing and enlightening the mind, but by compelling and controlling the body.

- ART. VIII.—1. GAMS: *Geschichte der Kirche im 19 Jahrhundert*. Tom. I. II. Vienna. 1859.
2. *Universalgeschichte der Christlichen Kirche. Lehrbuch für akademische Vorlesungen*. Von Dr. JOHANNES ALZOG, ordentl. Prof. der Theologie an die Universität Freiburg in Breisgau. Siebente Auflage. Mainz: Florian Kupferberg. 1860.
3. *Zustände der Kathol. Kirche in Schlesien*. Von M. A. THEINER. Regensburg. 1852.
4. *Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz unter der Römer-, Burgunder-, und Allemannenherrschaft*. Von Dr. E. F. GELPKE. Bern: J. Dalp. 1856.
5. Письма объ исторіи Сербовъ и Болгаръ. Соч. А. Гильфердинга. Москва, 1855.
6. *Guia del estado eclesiastico para el año de 1848*. Por D. PRIMITIVO FUENTES. Madrid. 1848.
7. *Heylige en Roemweerdige Persoonen &c. in geheel Nederland, &c.* Door C. SMET, PRIESTER. Gent. 1846. 4 voll.
8. *Das ordens religiosas em Portugal*. Por PEDRO DINIZ. Lisboa. 1853.
9. *Historia Ecclesiastica Islandiæ, ab anno 1740 ad annum 1840*. Auctore P. Pétursson, Toparchiæ Snaefellnesensis et Hnappadalensis præposito. Havniæ. 1841. 4^o.
10. *Den Danske Kirkes Historie efter Reformationen*. Ved LUDWIG HELWEG. Kjöbenhavn. 1851.
11. RIANCEY: *La Liberté de l'Eglise et la Persécution religieuse dans le Grand Duché de Bade*. Paris. 1853.
12. LANG: *Die oberrheinische Kirchenprovinz*. Tübingen. 1835.
13. *Kirche und Staat nach Ablauf der Kölner Irrung*. Von J. von GORRES. Weissenburg. 1842.
14. STOEVEKEN: *Clemens August [von Droste] in seinem Leben, Wirken und Tode*. Mainz. 1846.
15. *Concordat in Bayern*. Augsburg. 1847.
16. *Doctrine de Saint Simon*. Paris. 1826.
17. ARTAUD: *Histoire de Léon XII*. Paris. 1843.
18. *Paroles d'un Croyant*. Paris. 1833.
19. BAUTAIN: *Réponse d'un Chrétien aux Paroles d'un Croyant*. Paris. 1834.
20. BULAU: *Geschichte Deutschlands von 1806 bis 1830*. Hamburg. 1842.
21. *Polska w Kstalcie Dykcyonarza historyczno-statystyczno-geograficznego*. Opisana przez Jędrzeja Słowaczynskiego. Parije. 1833—1838.

CONTEMPORARY Ecclesiastical History—where shall we look for it? Inquire for any annals of the English Church from the rise of Wesleyanism to the present time—the work does not exist.¹ In France, the Abbé Guettée's history only comes down to 1801. In Spain and Portugal the series of newspapers would alone form the ecclesiastical annals of the last seventy years. Austria's Church history finds a tolerably interesting writer in Gams; but that of the other German States must be picked out of concordats and gazettes, local histories and descriptions. Italy, as distinct from the papacy, is quite silent. Prussia—as our list shows—is rather more fortunate. Of the Universal Church, during that most eventful period since the Congress of Vienna, there is no detailed history; the best *résumé* is undoubtedly contained in the last 150 pages of Dr. Alzog's book, which stands second on our list.

Whoever is to be the Baronius of the present century will have difficulties to contend with of which that great father of Church history, of which Pagi, of which Cabassutius, of which Fleury, of which Natalis Alexander, knew nothing. The enormous mass of works which he must procure and study, however formidable a hindrance, is nothing to that which arises from the disuse of Latin as the European language for Church history. Even granting that a scholar, devoted to the task, might master, in a few years, all the Romance languages of Europe sufficiently to serve his purpose, and, in a few more, under the same limits, the Teutonic tongues; then comes the more terrible difficulty of Slavonic, culminating from its easiest family, the old Church language, to its hardest, that most fearful study of Polish. And after that, Magyar lies behind him. And all this for the modern Church history of Europe alone.

We propose, in the following paper, to give a brief sketch of the Church history of Europe from the Congress of Vienna to the present time. We must bespeak the reader's kind consideration, and will previously apologise for the mistakes into which we are almost certain we shall fall. All we can pledge ourselves to do, is that we will not spare our labour. It is curious to think how very little is known of events which have happened in our own days, of personages who have lived within the last twenty years, when compared with similar events and people in the early and mediæval Church. How many, for instance, who are intimately acquainted with the life of Athanasius, of our own Thomas of Canterbury, of Gregory VII., never heard the name

¹ We may, however, hope that in a very short time the already commenced History of the English Church by Mr. Perry will satisfactorily fill this gap. It is a work which we shall probably have occasion to review.

of the ever-memorable Clement August von der Droste? Ask for the teaching of Nestorianism, and you shall get a fluent answer; put a question about S. Simonianism—and a blank silence. A man shall tell you what was condemned at Constance in 1415, who is perfectly ignorant what great doctor narrowly escaped censure at Bordeaux in 1853. And such names as those of Frayssinons, Balmez, Sailer, Hinterberger, Brentano, Klee, Gitzler, Powondra, Reinhe, and the like, how unknown are they to most English ears!

We commence at the period when the fountains of the great deep, broken up by the First Revolution, seemed to have subsided. It is marvellous to think that, from the very first to the very last, that tempestuous period only lasted twenty-six years; in other words, that our Queen's present length of reign is not so far short of measuring it. And what portentous changes it had brought on the Church! Monasticism swept out of France, a third part of her bishoprics suppressed, the union of the secular and ecclesiastical rule, in such sees as Salzburg, Cologne, Mayence, Liége, at an end for ever; the Holy Roman Empire, that secular correlative of the Papacy, shattered in pieces; the Church treasures of Spain and Portugal utterly gone; religious houses in Belgium escaping but by the skin of their teeth; Austria and Bavaria secularising nearly half their convents; in fact, Naples and Sicily the only lands that retained unaltered the old *régime*. The temporal power of the Papacy seemed trembling in the scale; another large Protestant kingdom had arisen, partly on the ruins of Austria. The times seemed very dark for the Latin Church when the Congress of Vienna met.

Gregory Barnabas Chiaromonte, Cardinal Bishop of Imola, was then in the sixteenth year of his pontificate as Pius VII. Considering the composition of the Congress at Vienna, that no man of eminent talent espoused the interests of the Church, that Dalberg, Primate of Germany, would not interfere, the general decision of the assembled statesmen was remarkably favourable to the Holy See, especially in the precedence which they accorded to its legates. True, Consalvi, Vicar-General of Constance, Papal Nuncio at Vienna, felt himself bound to issue a protest against certain acts which trenched on Roman prerogative; but, on the whole, the calm holy old man who then steered S. Peter's bark must have felt that he had achieved a victory. On the dissolution of the Congress, the altered territorial disposition of Germany first claimed the attention of Rome. The new kingdom of Wurtemberg had aggregated to itself parts of the once independent bishoprics of Constance, Wurzburg, Worms, Spire; Baden, too, Nassau, and Electoral Hesse had so changed their hands as to necessitate an altered

ecclesiastical régime. Accordingly, by the bull *Provida solersque sollicitudo* (Aug. 16, 1821), Freiburg in Breisgau (not many years before given up by Austria) was constituted the archbishopric for the Grand Duchy of Baden; with the suffragan sees of Rottenburg for Wurtemberg (the Lutheran ecclesiastics evincing a great objection to the creation of a bishopric in Stuttgart), Limburg for Nassau, Mainz for Hesse Darmstadt, and Fulda for Electoral Hesse. The bull *De salute animarum* (July 16, 1821) settled the ecclesiastical affairs of Prussia; and, in 1824, a concordat for Hanover re-established the two sees of Osnabrück and Hildesheim. The reintroduction of the Jesuits into some of the Italian States, the reform and aggrandisement of the Propaganda, principally carried on by Cardinal Pedicini, and a perpetual struggle with the Carbonari, occupied the Pope's last years. A concordat with Victor Emmanuel, of Sardinia, gave that kingdom nineteen bishoprics under the archiepiscopal Sees of Turin, Vercelli, and Genoa. Another, with Ferdinand, of Naples, united some few small sees in Calabria, increasing their number in Sicily. Dignities in abbeys, and collegiate and cathedral churches, were reserved in the first six months to the Pope, in the last to the bishop. Church property remained with an *uti possedetis*. Full of years and honour, Pius VII. departed this life August 21, 1823, having lived eighty-two years, and held the Pontificate twenty-three; a year shorter than his predecessor, longer than any other pontiff but one. Those who sat more than twenty-one years are only

	Years.	Months.	Days.
Pius VI.	24	6	14
Hadrian I.	23	10	17
Pius VII.	23	5	6
Alexander III.	21	11	23
S. Silvester I.	21	0	4

It is well known that an ancient tradition forbids the hope to any of S. Peter's successors *pervenire ad annos Petri*: i.e. to reign twenty-five years.

While we are on this subject, we may mention the very singular rule, or rather coincidence, which has been imagined to determine, in the earlier half of a century, the length of the reigning pontiff's life. Add his number to the number of his predecessor, and that to ten, and the result is the fatal year. Pius VII. succeeded Pius VI.—six and seven are thirteen; add ten, which makes twenty-three; Pius VII. died in 1823. Leo XII. succeeded Pius VII.—twelve and seven are nineteen; add ten, and you have twenty-nine; Leo XII. died in 1829. Pius VIII. succeeded Leo XII.—eight and twelve are twenty; add ten, thirty; Pius VIII. died in 1830.

Pius VII. was succeeded by the Cardinal Hannibal de la Genga, who took the name of Leo XII. The holiness of this pontiff's life was never denied; but his strong political views, concurring as they did with the height of the reactionism against the French Revolution, left, no doubt, an influence on the Holy See, which, in after days, brought forth sad trouble. He became an especial mark for Protestant indignation, on account of the bull '*Ut primum ad summi*,' in which he especially condemned Bible Societies. His chief work was the reorganization of the Bishoprics of Brazil—in connexion with the separation of that vast empire from Portugal. He died Feb. 10, 1829.

After an interregnum of forty-nine days, Cardinal Castiglioni succeeded as Pius VIII. Times were now changing. Reform was advancing with hasty steps in England—the Legitimist dynasty was almost at an end in France. The new pontiff had but little time allowed to show how completely he trod in the footsteps of his predecessor. He nobly exerted himself in the cause of the poor slaves in Brazil—put forth the whole power of Rome in the matter of mixed marriages in the Rheno-Prussian provinces;—entertained a closer correspondence with the 'Uniat' Armenians; and considered freemasonry of so deistical a tendency as to direct a bull against it. It was at the commencement of his pontificate that that most righteous act of 'Catholic Emancipation' was carried in England. The July revolution broke out—Charles X. became an exile;—and the difficulties and dangers of the time are imagined, by his biographer, to have shortened the good but rather narrow-minded pontiff's life. He went, as we may piously believe, to a better world, on S. Andrew's Day, 1830.

The conclave which followed—in its fifty days' length—fixed the eye of Europe on its deliberations, on account of the gloomy state of both the political and ecclesiastical atmosphere;—till at length, on Candlemas Day, 1831, the words, *Evangelizo vobis gaudium magnum—habemus Papam*, were heard from that eagerly watched window; and Cardinal Mauro Capellari was chosen, and took the name of Gregory XVI. The commencement of his Pontificate was marked by the rebellion of Bologna, and the uneasy feeling of sympathy which manifested itself in Rome itself—both crushed out, for that time, by the Austrian soldiery. The glory of his reign, however, consisted in the unusual number of brilliant scholars who then flourished at Rome. In dogmatic theology, Perrone and Delsignore; in Scripture exegesis, Patrius; in philosophy, Ventura, Orsi, Bonelli. Angelo Mai, the learned librarian of the Vatican, and that marvel of languages, Mezzofanti, were both advanced by Gregory to a place in the

Sacred College. The great blow which under this Pope the Roman Church received in the re-amalgamation with the Eastern Church of the Uniats of White Russia, has been too often referred to in these pages to need more than one sentence here; while the troubles connected with Lamennais, and the struggle between Cologne and Berlin, will better be told in another place. Gregory XVI. departed this life, June 1, 1846. As dark times seemed at hand, an instant choice was necessary. The conclave only sat three days, and on June 16 Cardinal Mastai Ferretti, Bishop of Imola, then only fifty-four years of age, became Pius IX.

The early alliance of this pontiff with liberal notions—its unsatisfactory result—the revolution at Rome—his flight to Gaeta—the French intervention—all these matters are fresh in the remembrance of our readers. Pius IX.'s ecclesiastical actions have certainly afforded matter for history. His encyclical to the Oriental Christians (Jan. 6, 1848), which we noticed at the time, raised a perfect storm of indignation in the East. Not unnatural, indeed, was the feeling; it is only to be regretted that the temper of the document was not equal to the soundness of its reasoning. The most celebrated and by far the saddest event of his pontificate was the proclamation of the Immaculate Conception as a dogma of the faith (Dec. 8, 1854), a day hereafter to be remembered with bitter tears by the Latin Church; and his confirmation of that declaration in the bull *Ineffabilis*—thenceforward a wider gulf than ever between us and Rome—while the great schism of East and West is fearfully exasperated, and grievous injury done to those great saints like Bernard, who strongly opposed as even a permissive belief what is now asserted as a certainty. The bulls of Sept. 24, 1850, and March 7, 1853, which constituted a Roman hierarchy respectively in England and in Holland, must not be forgotten. Happier works were, the Concordat with Spain (March 16, 1851), with Austria (Aug. 18, 1855), Wurtemberg (April 8, 1857), and Costa Rica (June 9, 1858). The principal Cardinals raised by him to the scarlet hat are, Von Geissel, Archbishop of Cologne; Von Scitoffski, Archbishop of Gran; Wiseman, so-called of Westminster; and Von Rauscher, of Vienna. The saints he has canonised are, of Jesuits—John de Britto and Peter Claver; John Grande, of the Order of S. John of God; and Paul of the Cross, who founded the order of that name; also Maria Anna de Paredes.

It is worth while, before we turn from the See of Rome, to look at the characters given to the Popes whose reigns we have been considering, in the famous prophecy of S. Malachi; because, whether his or not, we cannot but believe it to be more

than a coincidence that the prediction and fact should so tally. It was first printed in 1595, by Arnold Wyon, in his '*Lignum Vitæ*;' but the reader may most easily see it in Moreri's Dictionary, or M. Henrion's '*Histoire des Papes*' (Paris, 1832).

Pius VII. *Aquila rapax.*

Is not this a wonderful motto, when we remember how the French eagle swooped on the aged Pontiff, and ravened him out of his possessions?

Leo XII. *Canis et Coluber.*

Pius VIII. *Vir religiosus.*

Gregory XVI. *De Balneis Etruriæ.*

He was of the order of the Camaldulites; and the baths of Camaldole in Tuscany, their mother-house, are famous.

Pius IX. *Cruz de Cruce.*

The arms of Sardinia are a cross argent; a heavy cross indeed to the reigning pontiff. (We believe that this is the first time this explanation has been given—the prophecy not having been re-published since the crowning aggression of Sardinia.)

The remaining eleven Pontiffs—for according to this prophecy, there will be only eleven more—are thus characterised:

1. *Lumen in celo.*

6. *Pastor et nauta.*

2. *Ignis ardens.*

7. *Flos florum.*

3. *Religio depopulata.*

8. *De medietate lunæ.*

4. *Fides intrepida.*

9. *De labore solis.*

5. *Pastor angelicus.*

10. *Gloria olivæ.*

11. In persecutione extremâ sacræ Romanæ Ecclesiæ sedebit PETRUS

Romanus, qui pascet oves in multis tribulationibus: quibus transactis, civitas septicollis diruetur, et Judex tremendus judicabit populum.

In connexion with this last prediction, we may remark that Imperial Rome began and ended in Augustus—the ten tribes in Oshea or Hoshea.

We will next give a glance at the history of the Church in each principal European nation; and will commence with France.

On the accession of Louis XVIII. the Catholic faith was in the constitutional charter established as the national religion, with toleration for Lutherans and Calvinists; but not—so far as regards public teaching—for any sectarian who declined to class himself in one or the other of the two recognised heresies. The King himself was a man of real piety: but his encouragement of and attendance on religious processions in a city which, only twenty-one years before, had raised on its Cathedral high altar, and there worshipped, a naked prostitute, was doubtless in the highest degree injudicious. Taking the hint from our own

Christian Knowledge Society, 'The Catholic Association for the Dispersion of Christian Books' was formed under the presidency of the Duke de Montmorency, and soon obtained considerable success. A new concordat with Rome was arranged under the management of Count Blacas and De Persigny, (July 11, 1817), superseding that of Leo X. with Francis I. and the organic Articles of 1801. By the latter arrangement, the French sees had been fixed at the number of sixty; ten archbishoprics, fifty bishoprics. But one whole metropolitical province, Mechlin, with its seven bishops, had since been lost to France; so had the See of Nice, in the province of Aix. The suppressed *régime* had contained 23 archbishops and 133 bishops. The new concordat proposed to strike a mean between the two; and immediately met with great opposition in the Chambers, and could not be carried out till 1822; the number was then fixed at sixty-six bishoprics and fourteen archbishoprics. The French traveller will observe the evil consequences arising from the suppression or union of so many sees. Laon was joined to Soissons; the old diocese of Laon is one of the most dead in France. Beauvais and Noyon were added to Senlis; Noyon at least (for of Beauvais the writer knows less) is very sluggish. So with regard to Toul, which went to the comparatively modern see of Nancy. We give instances with which we are familiarly acquainted.

Another difficulty had to be contended against; the depressed and impoverished condition of the Church rendered it hard to find labourers for her vineyard. The younger sons of the nobility who could have been commendatory abbés, or deans, or who might have accumulated a few prebendal stalls in various collegiate churches, would now scorn to accept a bishopric. It was actually hailed as a symptom of reviving religion in 1823, that two hundred priests in that year had been ordained more than had died. The King exerted himself to remedy the financial difficulties of the Church; and, in a short time, her revenues were increased by the yearly increase of nearly 4,000,000 francs. What was that, however, compared to her enormous wealth previous to '89? And, in good truth, however laudable in Louis XVIII. was the effort, this outward mine of wealth could do nothing without the inward advances of earnestness. Nor were tokens of the latter wanting. Even then the influx of German and Flemish workmen had begun, which has since, in Alsace, raised Colmar and Thann, and Soultz and Uebweller, to be what they are. In like manner, Flanders has made Lille and Roubaix rivals of our own manufacturing towns. The Brothers of Christian Doctrine, the spiritual offspring of the venerable De la Salle, then first began to assume

their present importance; and the Ursulines were honourably distinguished above the other orders for their zeal in education, for the propagation of the faith prospered greatly. Nor was the Church deficient in writers; Frayssinous, Bishop of Hermonopolis *in partibus*—he died in 1841; De Maistre (1821); and Cardinal Bonald (1840), are, with whatever drawbacks in the case of the second, names that deserve to live in honour.

The accession of Charles X. (Sept. 19, 1824) was followed by intenser strife between the Royalist and Liberal parties. The King himself, like his brother, was a man of strong religious feelings. The attempt to carry a law of sacrilege (1825) through the Chambers, followed by the address of sixty archbishops and bishops, gave rise to a reaction. Very unwillingly, the monarch was compelled to suppress the Jesuits' schools, by an ordinance of July 16, 1828:—the bishops protested in no measured language; Leo XII. assumed the part of apologist for the King. Two short years, and the Three Days made Charles X. an exile for life; and the Gallican Church entered, under Louis Philippe, the Valley of the Shadow of Death.

The new charter no longer recognised the Catholic as the religion of the State; only as that of the majority of the French people. The Papacy had learnt wisdom from experience, and, in reply to a formal question of the Archbishop of Paris, ordered the clergy to acquiesce in, and to pray for, the new dynasty. Everywhere, however, the masses seemed to be separating from the Church; and, in consequence of an imprudent service performed in S. Germain l'Auxerrois for the soul of the Duke of Berri, on the anniversary of his murder, the mob not only gutted the church, but also the Archbishop's palace.

It was under these circumstances that Lamennais, Gerbet, Lacordaire, the Count de Montalembert, and others, united in a journal called *L'Avenir*: its motto, 'God and freedom,' showed its aim. The Church was not an arbitrary, not a Legitimist body: the Church, the champion of freedom in the middle ages, ought to be and should be so now. Intellectual freedom was her doctrine, and so forth;—and by degrees this kind of teaching degenerated here and there into a near approach to free-thinking. Still, the attempt was well meant; and, though some check was necessary, one cannot but feel that the authors were harshly treated. There was somewhat really dangerous, no doubt, in the work: somewhat also that only appeared dangerous to the narrow-minded advisers of the Court of Rome. *L'Avenir* was condemned by an encyclic of Gregory XVI. August 15, 1832, and immediately ceased to appear. The other writers submitted themselves unreservedly to the censure; Lamennais only grew hardened, and presently produced the '*Paroles d'un Croyant*,'

and the still more frightful 'Livre du Peuple,' the 'Essays and Reviews' of that day. He had now thrown off the profession of the Catholic faith; and the ablest pens on the side of the Church were put into requisition against him. None wrote better or more touchingly than his former friend Gerbet:¹—

'On sent tout ce que ces paroles me coutent. Celui qui déclare une guerre ouverte à l'Eglise, qui prophétise sa ruine, qui, dans les dernières pages de l'écrit qu'il vient de publier, n'a pas craint d'outrager, par le plus brutal sarcasme, l'auguste vieillard que la Chrétienté salue du nom de Père, a eu en moi un ancien ami, qui l'aimait d'une amitié née au pied des autels, et qui avait pour lui autant de dévotion, je crois, qu'aucun de ces amis nouveaux qui sont venus courtoiser sa révolte. A ce souvenir je tombe aux genoux, offrant pour lui à Dieu des prières, dans lesquelles il n'a plus foi: et je ne me relève que pour combattre dans l'ami de ma jeunesse l'ennemi de tout ce que j'aime d'un éternel amour.'

Thus fell one of the ablest of French ecclesiastics, Lamennais. May GOD have had mercy on his soul!

During the whole of Louis Philippe's troubled reign the Church seemed to be losing ground. No fashionable man, in the capital, but would have been ashamed to confess to the world that he was a regular attendant at mass. Readers of the French journals of that time must remember how, in the Chambers, if reference were wished to be made to any fact which could only be patent to a worshipper in the church, the stereotyped formula was,—'Happening to be in—such a church—the other day, *on occasion of a marriage*, I there saw,' &c.

And the opposition offered to this tide of irreligion was chiefly by the ultra-development of the worship of S. Mary,—or by that sickly, sensuous, sentimental devotion to the Heart of JESUS. At the same time, powerful pens were enlisted on the Catholic side; De Montalembert, whom, in spite of his wrong-headedness to the English Church, many writers in this Review are proud to reckon as a friend; Lacordaire, Rio:—and now, too, Rohrbacher began his learned, though confused and Ultramontane 'Histoire de l'Eglise.' The Abbé Migne's Patrologia—poor, hurried, and meagre as is the text—let no one ever trust to it—yet opened out a path which may hereafter be followed with great success. And later came the singular controversy, in which the Abbé Gaume took so great a share—that of the *Ver Rongeur*:—whether studies of the classical authors, usually so called, can be the fitting education of a Christian priest. The wisdom with which Rome mediated in the dispute is most remarkable.

Towards 1840, the Church began to recover her ground. The

¹ We quote, not from the original, which at this moment is not before us, but from Alzog.

very curious discussions instituted in the churches of Paris—where one priest took the part of the infidel, the other of the Catholic—both, within certain limits, doing their best, drew interested multitudes. The present writer is not afraid to express his opinion, that, horribly profane as our English habits would make them here, in the city where they had their birth they were right, and they did good. The increasing influence of the Church is seen in the ministerial circular of May 22, 1841, which gave the Sisters of Charity such increased facilities of doing good.

During the interval which separated the fall of Louis Philippe from the Presidentship of Louis Bonaparte, the future of the French Church, to human eyes, seemed very doubtful. The wretched imposture of La Salette, the more wretched, because so devoutly believed in by many and many a faithful soul, undoubtedly, on the whole, strengthened the Church's cause for a time. But was there ever such a success won without a reaction? The noble death of the Archbishop of Paris at the barricades, also, doubtless, was one living fact of the Church's influence.

The present Emperor, as we know, has found it politically convenient, on the whole, to 'patronize' the Church. *Non tali auxilio*. But in her own energy and hard work the French Church may, especially in particular provinces, take just pride. To our mind, Belgium is the most earnest of all Roman Catholic countries. But next to that, Brittany (speaking generally), the whole western coast of France, ancient Burgundy and Auvergne—then Normandy and Picardy—and then Dauphiné and Franche-Comté, are noble examples of real Christian work. Lorraine, Alsace, and great part of Champagne, seem to us about the deadest portion of the Church.

The remarkable efforts which Gallicanism has made during the last ten years deserve at least some notice. The *Observateur Catholique* is, we hope, known to many of our readers:—it ought at least to be. Still more remarkable is *L'Union*, avowedly written by members of different branches of the Church. The great literary work of this revival is the Abbé Guettée's 'Histoire de l'Eglise de France,' which will immortalise his name, while it has ruined his earthly prospects.

It was probably to override this nascent spirit of Gallicanism that the provincial Councils of 1853 were held. That of Bordeaux, held at La Rochelle, was by far the most remarkable. It was seriously proposed to condemn Bossuet, and the Gallican Articles of 1682: Guettée's history was condemned. As a specimen of the composition of all, let us give the names of the component Bishops of this:

Donnet, Cardinal Archbishop of Bordeaux.
Villecourt, Bishop of La Rochelle.
George, Bishop of Périgueux.
De Levezou de Vesins, Bishop of Agen.
Bailles, Bishop of Luçon.
Pie, Bishop of Poitiers.
Cousseau, Bishop of Angoulême.
Leberpeur, Bishop of S. Pierre and Fort-de-France (Martinique).
Despréz, Bishop of S. Denis de la Reunion (Isles de la R.).
Forcade, Bishop of Basse-Terre (Guadaloupe).

These three Colonial Bishops lead, by comparison with ourselves, to the consideration:—1. How utterly impossible it would be to conduct a colonial system like our own on such principles. 2. Have most of our prelates zeal enough to cross the Atlantic, or the Southern Ocean, to attend a provincial council?

We may now turn our attention to Spain.

Here, immediately after the return of Ferdinand VII. in 1814, we find the Church in the same unhappy league with Absolutism, and in the same opposition to so-called Liberalism, as in other European States. Ferdinand's tottering throne was upheld by the French advance of 1823: but he gradually lost the confidence of the 'priest party,' to use the wretched modern slang—in plain English, of the national Church—and even in his lifetime a plot was carried on for raising his brother, Don Carlos, to the throne. On the death of his first wife, the King married his niece, Maria Christina, of Naples. And, be it observed, to the infamous dispensation which permitted him so to do, the Church of Spain owes her bitterest enemies. Ferdinand, finding his health declining, and the hope of a son at an end, abolished the then Salic Law of Spain, declared his daughter heir, in exclusion of his brother, and died on Michaelmas Day, 1833. The Basque Provinces and Arragon broke out into rebellion against Isabella II., a child of three years old. The clergy generally favoured Don Carlos. It was our own struggle of 1715 and 1745 over again; only fought out with the semi-Arabian blood of Spaniards. The cholera attacked Madrid (1834). The monks—ultra-monarchical beyond the secular clergy—were declared to have poisoned the wells. The most horrible calumnies were propagated against them: but, alas! there was also much horrible truth—not so much against the monasteries as against the cathedral and collegiate churches. It is wretched to speak of such things. But, acquainted as the writer is with the Peninsula, it would be dishonest in him not to confess them. The Chapter of Seville had about seventy greater and fifty lesser dignitaries. Of the former, at the dissolution, scarcely one but had his acknowledged mistress—his

barragana—for the clergy had the disgrace of an especial word for such a connexion. What a state of things that must have been when the proverb was current—

‘En la calle de los Abades
Todos han *Tíos*, y ningunos *Padres*.’

Or this:—the ‘Commandments of the Canons:’—

‘El primero—
Es amar a Don Dinero;
El segundo—
Es amolar a todo el mundo;
El tercero—
Buen vaca y carnero;
El cuarto—
Ajunar despues de harto;
El quinto—
Buen blanco y tinto:
Y estos cinco se encierran en dos,
Todo para mí, y nada para vos.’

‘The first—Sir Money to love with zeal;
The second—to grind the world to meal;
The third—of mutton and beef good store;
The fourth—*he* may fast who can eat no more;
The fifth—good wine both white and red:
—And yet one thing remains to be said;
The whole of the five may be summ’d in two,
—All for me, and nothing for you!’

Nevertheless, though these horrid scandals no doubt prevailed in some of the larger monasteries and collegiate establishments, the countless country foundations were the positive blessings of the land. Centres of religious teaching, charity, civilization—excellent landlords, skilful agriculturists—they formed the material for the enormous mass of Spanish ecclesiastical memoirs, and by subscribing to them they rendered publication possible. No sooner did a Church history come out, than some 1,100 or 1,200 copies were taken by the monastic libraries. Hence such glorious works as Florez’s ‘*España Sagrada*,’ which though nominally continued since the dissolution, is so only by Government aid, is little read,—and *comparatively*, from the wholesale destruction of records, little worth reading.

The law of June 21, 1835, suppressed NINE HUNDRED monasteries. The rest fell under the Jewish apostate, Mendizabal, on the 11th of the following October. In 1837 the Cortes declared tithes and all other possessions of the Church national property. A small pension was allotted to each monk, but never, or seldom, paid. The present writer first visited Spain in June, 1843. It was the most touching thing to see these poor aged men, ghosts of their former selves, ashamed yet forced to beg, creeping about the chapels of that great cathedral

of Seville, or emerging from behind one of the enormous piers, and asking 'in the most sweet name of JESUS,' if it were but for a single *cuarto*. And all this sacrilege, did it enrich the land? Not by one farthing. The vast sums went, none knew where: no man made his fortune by them: the national exchequer was poorer than ever; land of course, having lost its best agriculturists, fell out of cultivation: and the cry of the poor went up to heaven. If any one wishes to see the *waste*, the brutal waste, of the suppression, let him go to Valladolid. There, in a hall of the museum, are some eighteen or twenty set of magnificent cinque-cento stalls, some inlaid with marqueterie, some after the Grinling Gibbons style of foliage, collected from the suppressed monasteries, and there brought together to no possible purpose; not studies of art, not valuable as examples, never used, and never to be used. There also are *colgaduras*, *trasparentes*, *sagrarios*, and *facistoles*, that once would have delighted the very heart of an ecclesiologist, but which now are buried in a saloon, where they are hurried over by the visitor, and then consigned to the silence and solitude of weeks. But to return to our subject. A plan of Church reform was brought forward in 1837, which involved the suppression of seventeen and the erection of five sees. Numbers of priests and several bishops joined Don Carlos. Rome refused bulls for their successors; see after see fell vacant; and serious thoughts were entertained of breaking off all connexion with the Papal authority, and declaring Spain an independent national Church. At length, when twenty-two bishoprics at home and in the colonies were widowed, Don Julian Villalba was sent as agent to Rome. The Church found, however, her defenders; and the journals called *The Catholic*, *The Prophet*, and *Religion* were not without their influence. Then came the Septembrist battle of 1840, which had for its aim the banishment of Christina. Insurrectionary juntas were formed all over the country: venerable pastors and bishops were everywhere driven away; and miserable priests, suspended for infamous lives, or overwhelmed with debt, had but to call themselves *liberal*, and to step into what place they might fancy. The majority of the assessors of the *Rota de la nunciatura Apostolica* were suspended by the Madrid Junta. The Papal Nuncio, Ramirez de Arellano, protested. The Government of Espartero instantly gave him his passport, and ordered the police to see him over the frontier. Gregory XVI. in an allocution of March 1, 1841, set forth the manifold wrongs which that Government had done to the Church of Spain. It was answered by a manifesto of Espartero. The mob was everywhere hounded on against the priests—the Minister of Grace and Justice especially distinguished himself by the brutality

of his language, and the insolence of his acts. The Pope, as a last resource, demanded, in an energetic epistle, the prayers of all the faithful for the persecuted Church of Spain.

Then it was seen that, notwithstanding all the dross that had gathered round it, there was yet fine gold that went into this furnace of affliction. Many a heroic action was then performed by priests, that yet lives in the hearth-talk of a winter night amidst the wild glens of the Alpujarras, or the upland farms of Oviedo, or the dreary *paramos* of Castile. Bishops there were, too, who set their faces like a flint against the incoming of blasphemy and infidelity, under the title of Liberalism. All honour to such men as Rafael de Velez, Archbishop of Santiago; as Fernando de Echanove y Zaldivar, Bishop of Tarragona; as Simon de Guardiola, of Urgel; as Fort y Puig, of Barbastro; as Felix Herrero y Valverde, of Orihuela; and as Domingo de Silos Moreno, of Cadiz. Balmez, perhaps the greatest theologian of his time, exerted himself in keeping up the courage of the younger priests. 'Learn wisdom,' he cried, 'at the foot of the cross, and this century is yours! Feel the privilege of the light affliction,' which is but for a moment, and unborn Spaniards shall honour you as the LORD'S confessors! On you hang the golden hopes of this country. Give way, and she will sink lower and lower in the scale of nations: stand firm, and the present troubles are but her agony into a glorious future!' Another noble name, too, Donoso Cortes, shows that even then, in her lowest degradation, Spain possessed at least one Catholic and honourable statesman. Against him it was that the *Times* used to spit its bitterest venom.

With the assumption of the reins of government by Isabella II. affairs mended a little. Gradually Rome and the Court of Madrid drew together; and in one day, Aug. 16, 1847, the following sees were filled:—Toledo, Cordova, Cuença, Sigüenza, Jaen, Carthagena, Osma, Avila, Granada, Santander, Gerona, Teruel, Majorca; thirteen in all. Almost as many were filled in the next month, and several in October. On March 16, 1851, the Concordat was signed, but the Church received another blow by the return of Espartero in 1854; and for a time the Nuncio Franchi left Madrid. Since then a miserable fraction of her property has been restored; but abbeyes, convents, in a mass, and many a fair collegiate church are gone for ever.

It must be confessed that there is very little Church-life in Spain at the present moment; and no country, not even England, gives less outward appearance of being Catholic. The Church at present consists of the following provinces; the number of suffragans is affixed to each.

Patriarchate of the Indies, titular.

Toledo, 7.

Valladolid, ¹ }

Santiago, 12. }

Seville, 5.

Granada, 2.

Burgos, 5.

Tarragona, 8.

Saragossa, 6.

Valencia, 4.

Santiago de Cuba, 2.

Manila, 3.

Besides which, there are the exempt bishoprics of Leon and Oviedo; the Abad-Mayor (always a bishop) of Alcala la Real; and the Prior-Bishops of Ucles and San Marcos de Leon. There certainly now needs some reform in territorial arrangements. There are so many exempt parishes, which once depended on some great abbey, but which of course have now no head; so many collegiate churches with episcopal jurisdiction, but which are now scarcely in existence. Some of these jurisdictions *vere nullius*, as the Spaniards call them, are hooked and dovetailed into the middle of a diocese in the strangest imaginable way. There are also arrangements of this nature. In the odd years certain parishes are under the diocesan; in the even years they are *vere nullius*;—others, in the odd months, belong to the former, in the even months to the latter. These singularities might have been harmless while the monastic system was flourishing: at present, in many instances, the parish priest is half his time under his bishop, and half his time without any superior.

Let us now look to Switzerland (and here we may mention, with especial approbation, Dr. Gelpke's History, at least so much of it as has already appeared). In earlier times that country was partly under the jurisdiction of Besançon, partly of Milan, partly of Constance, partly of Mainz: an arrangement than which it is not easy to conceive anything more inconvenient in itself;—besides its complication with the divided religions of the cantons. As every one knows, Freiburg, Solothurn, Luzerne, Zug, Unterwalden, Schwyz, Uri, Tessin, Wallis, are Catholic: Schaffhausen, Bale, Glarus, Zurich, Bern, Vaud, Neuchatel, are Protestant; the remainder being mixed. It was no wonder, therefore, that a general desire was felt for the establishment of a national bishopric. Pius VII. was very unwilling to concede the boon; and for some time, the bishopric of Constance being declared to have no longer any jurisdiction in Switzerland, the cantons were governed by Göldlin von Tiefenau, an ecclesiastic of great influence and piety, as Apostolic Vicar. The arrangement answered as long as he lived; but at his death, in 1819, the Prince-Bishop of Chur, Charles Rudolph von Buol-Schauenstein, who succeeded to the Vicariate Apostolic, could not command the same esteem. Aargau, especially, was anxious to be reannexed to Constance. A long series of

¹ Valladolid has only lately been raised to an Archbishopric, and the writer is not yet acquainted with the number of its suffragans.

alterations took place, which it would not interest the reader to particularize: they gave occasion to the bull *Inter multiplices* of Pius VII., and *Inter precipua nostri Apostolatus* of Leo XII. The present arrangement, which, having been partially adopted in 1841, was finally carried out by the Concordat of Nov. 7, 1845, is as follows:—The bishoprics are: 1. *Basle*, with jurisdiction over the cantons Luzerne, Zug, Solothurn, Aargau, Thurgau, Basle City, Basle Country, Zurich, and Bern north of the Aar—the see is at Solothurn. 2. *Geneva* and *Lausanne*, for Freiburg, Geneva, Vaud, Neuchatel, Bern south of the Aar—the see is at Freiburg. 3. *Sion*, for Wallis. 4. *Chur*, for the Grisons, Uri, and Unterwalden. 5. *S. Gall* (this bishopric was founded in the celebrated abbey of that name in 1823, but held with Chur till 1845), for Schwyz, S. Gall, Appenzell, Schaffhausen, Glarus. The Italian-speaking population of Tessin are partly under the Bishop of Como, partly under the Archbishop of Milan. To make the arrangement complete, there wants a national archbishop in the capital of the first Catholic canton, Luzerne. An Apostolic Nuncio, however, resides there, who performs the functions of a Metropolitan.

After the Revolution of 1830, the Liberal press became more and more bitter in its attacks against the Church. To oppose these, an able periodical, the *Schweizer Kirchenzeitung*, was set on foot in 1832. But a greater danger sprang up within the Church herself. A strongly Erastian party arose, who advocated her separation from the Roman See. A theologian of some eminence for learning, but no great reputation for piety, Fischer, was at the head: its organ was the *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung für Deutschland und die Schweiz*. The cantons which sympathised in the movement met at Baden, in 1834, and drew up certain Conference Articles, in which they made the Church the mere slave of the State. These Articles were condemned by Gregory XVI. in an encyclic of 1836. This led to the refoundation of the celebrated Jesuit College at Freiburg, originally founded by Canisius. Great success attended the work; the semi-infidel schools at Solothurn and Luzerne were well nigh crushed, and a great influx of parents took place into Freiburg. The educational establishment at Montet, for girls, conducted by Sisters of the Heart of Jesus, obtained also great influence.

At the commencement of 1841 the Council of Aargau, in formal contravention of a ground law of the Swiss Confederation, dissolved all the monasteries in that State, the revenues of which amounted to more than 30,000*l*. It was in vain that the Nuncio, Gozzi, and the Austrian ambassador protested. But the storm of indignation that followed compelled the National Council to declare all the sales of the convent property illegal.

In January, 1844, the nuns returned to their convents. Bishop von Muri was acquitted of all fault, and the State condemned in costs. The continuous persecution of their enemies induced the Catholic cantons, perhaps imprudently, to form the Sonderbund. Joseph Leu, one of their most prominent leaders, was basely murdered for his religion by Jacob Müller, who was guillotined for the action. Then followed the war of the Souderbund. The Catholics, besides their inferiority in numbers, were inferior to their opponents in military skill; and Freiburg first, then Luzerne, then the other cantons, were compelled, in the November of 1847, to yield. The *væ victis* followed. Forty convents were suppressed; the Bishop of Lausanne was imprisoned, and afterwards exiled. Then the reaction began. Good Bishop Marilley did more by his patience and labours in banishment than he could have effected by labouring at home. Catholic newspapers sprang up everywhere. A journal of Catholic art was set on foot. Catholic tracts were published for the poor Romance-speaking mountaineers of the Engadine. Catholic hymns and poems were composed for them. The reader may not be displeased to see a portion of one of the latter, as a specimen both of the feeling and of the language:—

‘ *L’amur da mamma.*

- * * * * *
- ‘ Un sacerdot ad ella s’avizina :
 “ Tien figl partit sün volonted divina :
 Guard’ Abraham
 Chi sün il clam
 Disch : Dieu, sun pront at der il figl ch’ eau am.”
- ‘ “ Sench hom,” replica la adoloreda,
 “ Respet tieu dir, ma non rest consoleda :
 Mien figl hè pers,
 E l’Univers
 Non pò, me pü, am der que ch’ eau he pers !
- ‘ “ Dieu ’l cour da mamma memma bain cognuoscha,
 E me vess El miss quel in taunt anguoscha :
 Ad Abraham
 Fet el il clam :
 Sarah vess dit : ‘ Mieu Dieu, eau memma l’am.’ ”

Finally, in Geneva, where, up to 1793, it was *death* to say mass, on Sept. 8, 1859, Bishop Marilley, returned from exile, and assisted by four bishops and 150 secular and regular priests, consecrated the Liebfrauen-Kirche.

The population of Switzerland is given as 882,859 Catholics, as against 1,292,871 Protestants.

We turn to Portugal.

And here we must remember, in the first place, that Portugal

differed most widely from Spain in having been deeply imbued with Gallican, and we fear we must also add with Erastian, views, since the Roman revolution of 1640. At that time Rome, out of complaisance to the Court of Spain, refused bulls for many years to the Bishops named by Dom João IV. (the *ci-devant* Duke of Braganza), and only gave way when a congregation of theologians had declared that, in the case of so obstinate a refusal, bishops might be canonically consecrated without their bulls. Then the influence of the great Pereira in the eighteenth century, and (next to his translation of the Bible) his two most celebrated works, the '*Tentativa Theologica*' (translated into English by Mr. Landon), and the '*Demonstração Theologica*,' led public opinion in the same way. Even to this day, such works as the Catechism of Montpelier (which Rome calls heretical) are text-books in Portuguese schools.

In the civil war of 1829—1833, there can be no doubt that all that was good in the kingdom was on the side of Dom Miguel. The very name, of course, was to Englishmen—*Times*-taught and constitution-adoring Englishmen—a synonym for tyrant. That he was rather a grave, stern man, adored by those that knew him, strictly just, a real lover of the poor, to whom that vile sycophant, Dom Pedro, pandered, by indulging their most brutal propensities, will probably here never be believed. It pleased God that the unrighteous cause should triumph. Now it was not in Portugal as in Spain. In Portugal, the monks had held aloof from all political agitation. Pedro wanted money, and so he took it from the monasteries; but he could not say, as Donna Isabella's advisers might with truth, that the religious houses had been against him. However, the decree of May 28, 1834, suppressed all at one stroke. Was Portugal enriched? Not by one *ceitil*.

No country had, in proportion to its size, so many monasteries as Portugal; nowhere was the progress of the nation more bound up with the prosperity of its religious houses. The Benedictine monastery of Lorvão was the first. The valley in which it was situated was then a waste howling wilderness; the monks made it the smiling garden it now is. Well says Diniz:—

'Estas asperezas namoravam os monges, que se com fadigas folgavam: elles mesmos não querião viver senão do trabalho da suas mãos, imitando os Apostolos. O paiz escabroso e deserto, por meio do trabalho dos frades, se tornara ameno e risonho: com o suor do seu rosto foi que elles fecundaram o solo, que hoje é tão fértil.'

Yes; they all fell at one blow: Benedictines, Conegos da Vida Commum, Bernardos, with that historical monastery of Sa. Cruz at Coimbra, Premonstratensians, the Congregation de

Rocha Amador, Franciscans, with their many divisions, Borrás (the Portuguese title for the third order), Observantines, with their four families, S. Francisco da Cidade (black with white girdle), Xabreganos (black with grey girdle), Recolets (grey with grey girdle), Apostolic missionaries do Varatojo (the same, with crucifix on breast)—how we might extend the list! We will only mention the very singular little order called *Pegos Verdes*, which was confined to Algarve. They were laymen, under no vow except of chastity for as long as they remained in their *conventículo*: they lived by the labour of their hands, and sometimes the whole order consisted only of three persons. They were free to leave their convent when they would, and sometimes did so. They were great favourites with the excellent Bishop of Silves, D. Francisco Gomes de Avellas. They, too, are gone. Batalha, the Westminster of Portugal, with its glorious memories of Aljubarrota; Alcobaça, the finest Cistercian house south of the Pyrenees—it is marvellous how one wicked man's will could, in the teeth of a nation's wishes, prevail to their destruction. Hear what Lorvão is now. The description is from the pen of the celebrated historian Herculano, the first literary man in the Portugal of to-day:—

'Imagine, meu amigo, uma noite, de inverno, no fundo desta especie do poço perdido no meio da turba de montes que o rodeiam: imagine dezoito ou vinte mulheres idosas mettidas entre quatro paredes humidas e regelladas, sem agasalho, sem lume para se aquecerem, sem pão para se alimentarem, sem energia na alma, e sem forças no corpo, comparando o passado, sentindo o presente, antevendo o futuro. Imagine o vento que rugue, a chuva ou a neve fustigando as poucas vidraças, que anida restam no edificio: imagine essas orgias tempestuosas da natureza que passam por cima das lagrimas silenciosas das pobres cistercienses: e as horas eternas que batem na torre. Imagine tudo isso, e sentirá accender-se-lhe no animo uma indignação reconcentrada e inflexivel.'

It was only in 1841 that negotiations were again entered into with the Holy See, and the Nuncio Capaccini came to Lisbon to settle a future concordat. In 1843 the Pope gave new bulls to the ecclesiastics nominated to the Patriarchate of Lisbon, the Archbishopric of Braga, and the See of Leiria; but the concordat was not actually signed till after the accession of Dom Pedro V. In 1856 the cholera, in 1857 the yellow fever, ravaged Lisbon, and the exertions of the French Sisters of Charity were ceaseless and marvellously blessed. For this the 'Liberal' party has never ceased to persecute them, and has now at last forced them to leave the country. Our own Sisters of Sion House, settled at Lisbon for so many years, have now once more returned to England, where it will be the only conventual establishment which has maintained itself from a period antecedent to the Reformation, with the one exception of

that which till lately was at Spettisbury, but now is in Devonshire: the representatives of S. Margaret at Dartford.

In connexion with the subject of Portugal, we must say a few words on the so-called *Schism of Goa*, and the famous *direito do padroado*.

In 1534, Paul III. by the bull *Æquum reputamus* erected Goa into a see, suffragan to Funchal in Madeira. The Portuguese, as we all know, were at that time the only European power in India, and to the King of Portugal was given the right of patronage in nominating to the See. Paul IV. in 1557 raised it to a metropolitical rank; he erected the Sees of Cochin and Malacca to be its suffragans, and as before vested the right of patronage in the Crown of Portugal. In 1575, Gregory XIII. founded the See of Macao, also suffragan to Goa, and gave the patronage as before, *but now for the first time with an additional stipulation*; namely, that the King should provide all the funds necessary for the well-being of these sees, and should not permit them to be vacant an unnecessary time. By degrees there were added as suffragans, Funai, separated from Macao (1588), Angomala (1600), Meliapor (1686), separated from Cochin; Pekin and Nankin (1690), separated from Macao. All these were in the patronage of the Crown of Portugal, *sub conditione dotationis et fundationis*, and with the cautela of Gregory XIII. That Crown presently stretched its pretensions further, and considered its consent necessary before any missionary at all could enter the East. Clement VIII. so far gave in to this assumption as to forbid that any missionary should enter Asia except by way of Lisbon and Goa; but Paul V., finding the great inconveniences of the restriction, annulled it. An almost open war broke out between the clergy of Goa and those who entered India by other routes. They stigmatised them as *propagandists*, threw every obstacle in their way, and treated them as open enemies. That clergy, very rich and luxurious, was now scandalously inattentive to its duties. There were at one time three millions of Roman Catholics in India, there is now only one million; whole villages, once Christian, have relapsed into heathenism, and the result is professedly owing to the supineness of the Goan priests.

Innocent XII. found himself in a difficulty with regard to the increasing Church in China. The erection of Pekin and Nankin into bishoprics had not been at all pleasing to the Portuguese monarch, who, if he wished for the *direito do padroado*, had the expense of the institution and maintenance of these sees, and he now absolutely refused to erect any more. The Pope met the difficulty by sending out Vicars-Apostolic, and peremptorily forbade the Diocesan Bishops to exercise any

authority within the new vicariates; a violent aggression on episcopal rights, and an evasion of the original stipulation with the Portuguese monarch. The clergy of Goa, however, whatever were their rights, were conducting themselves in a way which made them the scandal of India. The Bishop of Berytus *in partibus*, being sent by the Supreme Pontiff to investigate the causes of the decline of the Church there, was declared by the Inquisition a rebel against the authority of the Primate, and the faithful were forbidden to hold any spiritual intercourse with him. This kind of struggle went on for some years. The Primate, supported by all the authority of the Viceregal Court, was more than a match for the distant power of Rome. Some of the Papal missionaries submitted to the diocesan authority; some of the Vicars-Apostolic accepted a second nomination from the Primate as his own Vicars-General. Clement X. in 1673 prohibited such acceptance in future; and the brief was forthwith declared, by the Archbishop of Goa and his chapter, surreptitious and apocryphal.

Meanwhile, the power of Portugal fell to pieces, but her kings clung only the more fondly to the right of patronage, though the sees to which they presented were no longer in their possession. The suppression of the Jesuits, in 1773, was the death-blow to the system of Vicariates-Apostolic, and from that period all the power remained with the Primate and his clergy. Most of the latter were Indo-Portuguese, a class for whom the natives entertain the greatest horror. They united the evil qualities of both races, spoke an unintelligible patois, scandalously sold the offices of the Church, even baptism, and contentedly saw Christianity die out in one village after another, and whole tracts of country that once abounded with converts returning to the worship of Vishnu and Siva. In 1778 the Indo-Portuguese clergy were expelled from Bombay on account of their scandalous lives, and the English Government requested the nearest Vicar-Apostolic to take on himself the charge of its Roman Catholic subjects. He obtained authorization from Rome to do so, but the Primate of Goa never ceased to claim jurisdiction at Bombay. In 1791, the East India Company gave notice to the Archbishop that they recognised no authority in him; and he actually wrote to demand from the Pope the expulsion of the Vicar-Apostolic. In the meantime, the Bishoprics of Cranganor, Cochin, and Meliapor remained vacant for half a century.

Gregory XVI. had been, previously to his elevation, Prefect of the Propaganda, and in that capacity was intimately acquainted with the condition of India. In 1832, Cardinal Pedicini notified to the Portuguese ambassador that his master

must either perform his duty by filling the vacant sees, or definitely renounce the right of patronage. Dom Miguel promised attention to the request as soon as the civil war should be at an end. The revolution prevailed, and the Pope, finding that the new Government was in almost open revolt against Rome, at length resolved to act. With the consent of the English Government, he erected a Vicariate-Apostolic in Calcutta (April 18) and in Madras (April 25). The Goan clergy were furious at what they termed the intrusion of the 'Turkish bishops' (they happened to have their titles from places in Turkey). The Chapter menaced with excommunication all who should entertain any relations with them. Attempts were made to render the English Government suspicious of them. But Gregory was not to be turned from his purpose. He instituted the Vicariate of Ceylon, Dec. 23, 1836, and that of Madras June 3, 1837, and at the same time despatched a few Jesuit missionaries to India. The Goanese at this time charged for confessions of one year, two vintens; of two years, a rupee; of three years, two rupees: baptisms cost three vintens. At length, India being torn asunder by an open schism, Gregory XVI. by the brief *Multa præclare* (April 24, 1838) abrogated the decrees of his predecessors, abolished the Sees of Cranganor, Cochín, and Meliapor, marked out the limits of the Vicariates, making them dependent on the See of Rome only, and abolishing the metropolitical rights of Goa. It might have been a necessary step; but still one cannot help seeing in it another instance of the disregard evinced by Rome to diocesan rights.

After the interrupted relations between Rome and Portugal were restored, José Maria da Silva Torres was nominated to the Archbishopric of Goa. In the Consistory of June 16, 1843, it was resolved that the Bull of Institution should be accompanied by letters apostolic, limiting the jurisdiction of the new Archbishop to Portuguese territory only, and that he should swear to observe them, as well as the brief *Multa præclare*. He did so, and sailed to India; but on his arrival at Goa, he ratified all the preceding acts of the Chapter; declared publicly that the Pope had no power to annul the constitutions of his predecessors without the formal consent of the Crown of Portugal; and to strengthen his cause, he ordained no fewer than 800 ecclesiastics of different degrees, men who had been hurriedly educated in the episcopal seminary, and who had little acquaintance with any theological subject except the *jus patronatus*. These men were sent out into the vicariates, and gave considerable scandal.

The Archbishop allied himself closely with Antonio Teixeira, an Augustinian friar, who had been nominated by the Portuguese

Government to the see of Meliapor, but had not been able to procure his bulls. He now visited his diocese, and the opposing parties in some cases came to blows. Gregory XVI. addressed an admonition to the Archbishop, but without effect, and at the time of the death of that pontiff the adherents of Goa were reckoned at 240,000.

Pius IX. endeavoured to procure the recall of the Primate. It was agreed that he should be transferred to an archiepiscopate *in partibus*, be made coadjutor of Braga (which boasts itself, in opposition to Toledo, the primatial See of All the Spains), with the promise of succession: the actual prelate was nearly eighty; besides which, he was to have the lucrative post of Commissioner of the *Bulla do Cruzado*. The Primate certainly could not complain of the terms, and accordingly he became Archbishop of Palmyra, and returned to Portugal. In his allocution to the Cardinals, of Feb. 17, 1851, before naming Da Silva future successor at Braga, the Pope commented in severe terms on the 'schism of Goa;' and a reply to that allocution was printed at Lisbon, and reprinted in Goa.

On receiving official intelligence of the vacancy of the See, the Chapter of Goa elected as Vicar-General the Bishop-designate of Cochin, and named one Antonio Mariano Soares Archdeacon. This ecclesiastic called himself Vicar-General of Goa, in Bombay: five parishes in the city, and six in the island of Salsette, recognised his authority. In Calcutta, Madras, and Meliapor, the party was also strong. But the absence of an Archbishop, and the necessity of applying for confirmation to the Vicars-Apostolic, weakened the national party, and the Chapter summoned the Portuguese Bishop of Macao, Jeronymo José da Matta, to their aid. He landed at Bombay in the February of 1853. He celebrated pontifically, ordained some deacons and subdeacons, and confirmed 150 persons, first preaching at some length on the schism. Thence he went to Cochin and other places, performing episcopal acts everywhere. Doctor Hartmann, Bishop of Derbe *in partibus*, was Vicar-Apostolic of Bombay. He published a protest against the intrusion of the Bishop of Macao, sent a circular to the other vicars requesting their advice in this emergency, and despatched his private secretary with all speed to Rome. The *Bee*, the organ of Goa, continued to chronicle the Bishop of Macao's proceedings in a succession of ovations. He proceeded from Bombay to Goa, where he ordained thirty-one priests and eleven deacons. At length an open rupture occurred in Mahim, a village near Bombay. Doctor Hartmann was about to perform some office in the church, when its curate, of the opposite party, refused to allow him. The civil power was

called in, and endeavoured to eject the Vicar-Apostolic. The latter actually remained a prisoner in the church for a whole month rather than yield possession; a most unedifying spectacle, and one which gave occasion to many a leading article in the local press on the unity of the Roman Church. It was not a little curious, however, to see the *Telegraph* and *Courier*, and the *Bombay Times*, taking part with Bishop Hartmann on the most purely Erastian grounds; that the Roman Church in English territory owed obedience to the Queen and her ecclesiastical authorities; and to hear similar arguments adduced by the Ultramontane party.

In the meantime Bishop Hartmann's circular was receiving answers. Besides the three vicariates—Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay—of which we have spoken, thirteen others had been founded: in the whole sixteen were 303 priests and 670,000 faithful. (The number of Anglican priests, we may observe, at that time was only 131.) The following signed an address, prepared by Bishop Hartmann, requesting the condemnation of the Bishop of Macao, and the excommunication of those priests who refused obedience to the vicariates:—the Vicars-Apostolic of Calcutta, Carew; of Combatore, Bressellac; of Colombo and his coadjutor, of Dacca, Olliffe; of Jaffna; of Madura, Canoz (a Jesuit); of Mangalore, Charronau; of Pondicheri, Bonnaud; of Imla and Verapoly; of Vizagapatam, Neyret. The Vicar of Agra was not asked, *it is said*, because there were no 'schismatics' in his diocese; he of Ava Pegu could not, on account of war, be reached; he of Hyderabad declined signing; he of Madras was silent; he of Patna absent.

In the meantime, Doctor Hartmann's secretary had reached Rome. It was easy to foresee the consequence. A brief was addressed to India, condemning in the strongest terms the Bishop of Macao, and threatening him, Antonio Mariano Soares, and three other priests with excommunication, if they did not submit in two months after the publication of the instrument. On receiving notice of it, the Bishop-designate of Cochin, Vicar-General of Goa, denounced the brief as detestable and apocryphal; forbade the clergy of the diocese to pay any obedience to it; the Portuguese 'Governor-General' rejected it 'with contempt,' as an invasion of the rights of the Crown; and the *Bee* published a series of articles to show that blind obedience to Rome was no part of the duty of a Catholic. The Chambers at Lisbon protested against the brief, which produced a counter-protest from a large body of the clergy, the Bishop of Guarda taking the lead. In India, the possession of the churches was settled by a civil action in the court of Bombay—Bishop Canoz, of Trichinopoly, on the one side; a

priest, with national sentiments, named Arokkianader, on the other—and the judgment was in favour of the Goanese clergy; a heavy blow to the Vicars-Apostolic.

We have already dwelt too long on this episode, and will only add that the schism ran on for six years longer, and has only recently been ended by a Concordat with Dom Pedro. The terms, while leaving the Vicars-Apostolic in possession of the powers for which Rome contended throughout, are not unfavourable to the Crown of Portugal.

Let us now direct our attention to the Church in Bavaria. At the close of the last century, free-thinking and Erastianism were rampant in that land. Maximilian Joseph, who succeeded in 1799, himself a man of no religion, found in the minister Montgelas an unscrupulous agent in impoverishing the Church. Seventy monasteries, some of them on the most magnificent scale, were suppressed at one stroke. Great havoc was made in the cathedral and parish sacristies, which up to that time had been peculiarly rich in works of Christian art. Cardinal della Genga, afterwards Leo XII., had with great trouble almost concluded an arrangement in 1807, when Napoleon interposed, and the Church dragged on a stormy existence till 1817, when at length the Concordat was signed. The oath enforced by the new Constitution caused many scruples among the clergy, which, however, were allayed by the royal proclamation of Sept. 15, 1821; in point of fact, explaining it away. With the accession of Louis, in 1825, happier times began, and Bavaria became the seat of Church art; pity only that, so far as the monarch was concerned, the separation of cultivated taste and pure morality was so complete! A *Society for the Propagation of Good Books* was vigorously supported and extensively useful; and Gorres, Möhler, Dollinger, Reithmayr, and Klee are names which will live in the memory of the Church.

Trèves has during the present century achieved a high reputation for the earnestness and success of its Church-work. Three such succeeding bishops as Sailer, Wittmann, Schwäff are seldom vouchsafed to one see. Partly through their efforts, aided by the, in that respect, excellent disposition of the King, several religious houses have been founded or refounded, especially of Capuchins, Franciscans, and Carmelites; the Redemptorist Fathers and the Brothers of Mercy have been introduced; Sisters of Charity and Sisters of Compassion have numerous convents; while nowhere have the efforts of the Nursery of the Good Shepherd, for the aid of fallen women, been more blessed. The *Ludwigs-Verein*, a society for missions to North America and Asia, has an increasing income and an extending work. Its statutes were published in 1839. Under

her present King, Maximilian, Bavaria presents to the eye one of the bright spots of the Western Church.

We naturally turn next to Prussia. Till the year 1821, though professedly tolerated, and regarded with a kind of contemptuous compassion by successive monarchs, the Church was at a very low ebb. In that year, the bull *De salute animarum*, which concluded an agreement with the State, enabled the almost quenched spirit of Catholic enterprise to break forth anew. The episcopate was set on a different footing. Those curses of mediæval Europe, the prince-bishoprics and elector-primates of Rhine-land, had been swept away for ever, and now in their stead rose the modern Archbishopric of Cologne, with his suffragans of Trèves, Munster, and Paderborn; the Archbishopric of Gnesen-Posen, and the Bishopric of Ermeland. Münster, whose prince-bishop, only 200 years before—the reader may remember Dryden's line,

‘ Let Munster's prelate ever be accursed ’—

had employed himself in battering down the houses of his flock about their ears, now became the home of a hard-working apostolic bishop, counting his revenue by kreutzers where his predecessor numbered them by florins. In the meantime, the researches of Niebuhr and Bunsen, by calling out the intellectual energies of the Church, gave her real assistance; in the same way that the Tercentenary of the Reformation in 1817 called out Mühler's immortal ‘*Symbolik*.’ The especial studies of the priesthood were directed and furthered by the theological faculty of the University of Bonn, and the *Lyceum Hosianum* for the Diocese of Ermeland and the Catholic Academy of Münster.

But the most remarkable figure in the German ecclesiastical history of the present century is undoubtedly Clement Augustus von Droste, Archbishop of Cologne. He had been Vicar-General of Münster, and while in that position maintained a gallant conflict with the Prussian Government on the subject of theological studies. His predecessor, Ferdinand Spiegel, had been a supporter of Hermesianism, that semi-Pelagian, semi-rationalistic system, which had been condemned by Gregory XVI. in 1835. It had still, however, spread amongst the younger clergy, and Von Droste, in every possible way, endeavoured to stop its further progress. Among other means to this end, he drew up eighteen theses, principally directed against the new heresy, which he required to be signed by candidates for holy orders. The Prussian Government immediately exclaimed that its rights were injured, and peremptorily demanded the recall of the theses. Countless pamphlets

appeared on both sides of the question: at the same time also the question of mixed marriages opened another conflict. A convention had been drawn up between the afterwards notorious Bunsen, on the part of the King, and Archbishop von Spiegel on that of the Church; by which the latter agreed that the former discipline on the subject of marriages should be relaxed, so as not to be inconsistent with the educational State-minute of 1825. But Bunsen only signed *subject to higher approval*; Von Spiegel absolutely. Pius VIII., in his short pontificate, condemned the concession; and Von Droste declared himself unable to follow in his predecessor's steps. He would not, he said, by serving two masters, bring himself to the same deathbed as that of one of his suffragans—it was the Bishop of Trèves—who then bitterly repented, and, as far as he could, undid his unhappy compliance. On this the Government had recourse to the *ultima ratio regum*; and on Nov. 20, 1837, the brave-hearted prelate was seized, exiled, and imprisoned at Nieburg. Bunsen, the perpetual reviler of persecutors in all shapes, preferred revenge to consistency.

There arose a burst of indignation from the Roman Catholic world. In an allocution of Dec. 10, 1837, the Pope condemned in the strongest manner the act of the Government, exhorted his beloved brother to stand firm, and praised him in the highest terms. Next Martin von Dunin, Archbishop of Posen and Gnesen, who had already, independently of Cologne, been engaged in the same battle against the ministry, issued a very strongly worded pastoral brief; on which the *Oberlandesgerichte*, at Posen, pronounced him suspended from office, and condemned him to six months' confinement in a fortress. He was accordingly imprisoned in that of Colberg. From that moment a Catholic reaction took place all over Germany. Addresses without number poured in to the two Archbishops; the clergy of the archdiocese of Gnesen-Posen, as was fitting, led the way. It happened that a council was assembled at Baltimore when the news of these proceedings reached America, and the archbishop, with twelve of his suffragans, addressed a fraternal letter of sympathy and encouragement to the two confessors. All the Bishops of Prussia were ranged on the same side, with the single exception of Sedlnitzky, Prince-Bishop of Breslau, and he soon afterwards resigned his see.

While matters stood thus, the King died, and was succeeded by Frederick William IV. (June, 1841). This monarch was known to be, theoretically at least, an admirer of the Church; and his first actions did not disappoint his Catholic subjects. The Archbishop of Gnesen was, in less than two months, notwithstanding the general outcry of the Liberal papers, restored to

his flock. In two pastoral letters he strongly forbade mixed marriages for the future, but recommended that those who had contracted them should, in the confessional and on the sick-bed, be treated with all tenderness. The difficulties for the future were thus solved, the State deprecating them as earnestly as the Bishop; for the past, it must be confessed that the victory lay with the Government. Archbishop von Dunin, to the deep sorrow of all his flock, was taken from the world on S. Stephen's Day, 1842. Before this, however, the King had granted the bishops what had hitherto been denied them, a free resort to Rome.

In Cologne, too, Frederick William acted with considerable nobleness of spirit. The King of Bavaria permitted the Bishop of Spire, Van Geissel, to act as coadjutor of the archdiocese; in order that negotiations might be set on foot with Rome. The Prussian monarch officially disavowed his predecessor's violence. The Archbishop, however, finding his health fail, and weary of strife, resigned his post in a beautiful pastoral, in which he told his people that, if he seemed to retire from the active battle of his diocese, it was only that, like Moses, he might be the better able to lift up his hands for them to heaven. He died October 19, 1845; and to him, undoubtedly—to his firmness and to his sufferings—is to be ascribed the remarkable regeneration of the Church in almost all the great cities of the Northern Rhine; nowhere, however, more remarkable than at Coblenz. The interest which the King took in that noble work, the completion of Cologne, showed his friendly disposition at least to Catholic art; while perfect freedom was guaranteed to the Roman Church in Prussia by the 15th organic article of Dec. 5, 1848.

Let us now glance at the ecclesiastical condition of Rhineland, where the conquests of Napoleon had obliterated all the old landmarks, and his overthrow had destroyed the new *régime*. Von Dalberg, Primate of Ratisbon,¹ the leading ecclesiastic of Germany during the troubles, died in February, 1817. Shortly afterwards the Protestant princes of Germany resolved on a general meeting, for the purpose of an arrangement with Rome regarding the change, or creation of dioceses, now absolutely necessary, from the vast alteration of territorial boundaries, and the mediatization of so many little states. There met at Frankfort-on-Main (March 24, 1818), the ambassadors of Baden, both Hesses, the four Hanseatic towns, Mecklenburg,

¹ Some of our readers will remember the rather striking effigy of this prelate, kneeling on a raised pedestal before a very lofty cross, in the centre of the nave of this cathedral.

Nassau, Oldenburg, Waldeck, and Wurtemberg; those of Wurtemberg and Baden taking, as was natural, the initiative in the deliberations. To the episcopal arrangements consequent on this meeting we have already alluded in the brief sketch we gave of the pontificate of Pius VII. But difficulties presently arose. One of the bishops-designate for the new sees, by name Wessenberg, had already been coadjutor to Von Dalberg at Constance, and the Pope now refused him his bulls. The reason; the See of Rome imagined these prelates to have engaged in common to carry out the so-called *Kirchenpragmatik*, the organic articles proposed by the Protestant states as a kind of concordat, but disapproved by the Pontiff. These matters were finally arranged by Leo XII. in his bull, *Ad Dominici gregis* (April, 1827). In the October of that year Bernard Boll was installed in that lovely cathedral of Freiburg in Breisgau as first archbishop; and the Vicariates-General came to an end. But fresh troubles were at hand. The thirty-nine *Paragraphs* of January, 1830, created a deep sensation all over Germany. By these the offices of the Church were subjected to a *Placet* from the police-office. The bishops tamely yielded; only one generous defender of the liberty of Catholic rites was found to lift up his voice—the free Baron von Hornstein. Pius VIII. in a brief to the prelates of the Upper Rhine for this reproaches them with having obeyed man rather than GOD. The troubles that followed, and especially the daily encroachments made by the civil power on the rights of his Church, embittered and shortened Archbishop Boll's days; he could not procure the removal of one Reichlin-Meldegg, an almost professed Socinian, from the chair of Catholic Theology at Freiburg.

The stand made by Van Droste, in the neighbouring Prussian territories, quickened the exertions of the Church in Wurtemberg and Baden. The Bishop of Rottenburg brought in a *Motion*, in the second Chamber of the former State, which, under that name, became the watchword of ecclesiastical liberty; it contained nine main articles; which, though rejected at the time, were constantly kept in view by those who succeeded to the strife. In Baden things were worse; for here a section of Catholics were for a free German Church—free, that is, from Rome, but chained to the wheels of the State. At the head of these was Dominic Kuenzer, the pastor of the Spital Kirche at Constance, and he had a strong following at Carlsruhe. But Boll had successors of a different calibre to himself. Archbishop Demeter first, and then *Von Vicari*, the present venerable Metropolitan, with whom we have the honour to be slightly acquainted, loved but to act on that famous saying of S. Bernard's, *Nihil magis diligit Deus in hoc mundo quam libertatem ecclesiæ suæ*.

It was hoped that the Baden troubles of 1848, which shattered to pieces the old order of things, would have knapped asunder the chains of the Church; but the complete toleration now given by the great Protestant state, Prussia, was in these comparatively little kingdoms, on various pretences, desired. In the February of 1853, the Metropolitan Von Vicari invited his suffragans of Rottenburg, Mainz, Lemburg, and Fulda, to a conference at Freiburg. The result of this, and a later conference, was a demand of these four points: 1. Free intercourse with priests and laity; 2. Catholic schools; 3. Permission of religious houses; 4. The rights guaranteed to the Church by the Peace of Westphalia. After innumerable difficulties, a convention was drawn up between the King of Wurtemberg and the Apostolic See, in July, 1857, which has, we believe, proved to work well; and another between the Grand Duke of Baden and the same Pontiff, in June, 1859, which gave rise to great troubles, and was explained by a ducal manifesto in the following spring. Affairs in Baden still remain, to a certain extent, unsettled; though in this nation, the Catholics are two to one—in Wurtemberg only one to two. Of all these States we say, in the old rhyme,

Bayern und Pfalz,
Gott erhalt's!

We have entered so fully, on former occasions, into the Church history of Holland and Belgium, that we may omit those states now, and proceed to Austria.

Austria came unprepared to the great struggle, on account of the pseudo-philosophical reforms of the Emperor Joseph. Suppressed and impoverished monasteries, and pedantic routine taking the place of Church education, had not only their usual reward, but actually lost Belgium. The new *régime*, by incorporating the princely domains of the archbishopric of Salzburg into the imperial domain, so far did the Church! good service. If any one wishes to judge for himself how those half-secular, half-religious principalities worked, let him read the second volume of the '*Germania Sacra*,' of Hausiz, that which contains the archbishopric of Salzburg. We would refer him especially to the Episcopate of Francis, Count of Harrach, towards the end of the seventeenth century. Hausiz honours him with an eulogy which, so far as words go, would seem rather extravagant if applied to S. Augustine. Yet the fact comes out that, because some poor wretch trespassed on his rights of free warren, this admirable prelate *condemned him to the galleys for life*. It is only right to add that, some years after, he procured the prisoner's liberation.

As Austria returned more nearly than did the other German

States to the old *régime*, there is the less to say of her recent Church history. Notable names therein are Leopold Chlumczansky, first Bishop of Leitmentz, and then Archbishop of Prague; the Count von Firmain, Archbishop, first of Salzburg, then of Vienna; and, above all, F. X. Salin, Bishop of Grork. The Jesuits re-entered in 1820; the Redemptorists in 1816. In September, 1822, the Archbishop of Gran called together a National Court of Hungary. That primacy is the richest in the world; till 1848 it averaged 50,000*l.* a year; in that year the Diet framed an act which diminished it, proportionately with the other sees, to about 34,000*l.* Surely it may be doubted whether, in the present state of things, such extravagant wealth is good for the Church. The most important event of late is the recent Concordat, the ceaseless object of insult to Protestant papers.

We have still, to take a fair view of the ecclesiastical history (in its widest sense) of modern Europe, two more papers to write: whether they shall appear or not must depend on the wishes of our readers.

The first would contain a sketch of the exclusively Protestant countries, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finmark, with the Protestant and Reformed communities of Germany.

The second, the struggles of the Roman Church in the border lands between herself and the East; Wallachia, Moldavia, Dalmatia, Bulgaria,—above all, Poland.

The reader will observe, that, except so far as the Papal See is concerned, we have made no mention of Italy. The fact is, we dare not allow ourselves to speak of the present contest. We are not speaking of the question of the suppression of the Pope's temporal power, but of the sacrilege and confiscation which have followed in the rear of Sardinian aggression and success.

That mere Protestants should see in every aggression on Rome a matter of thankfulness, is not surprising. That mere Anglicans should see in the hankering of modern Chambers after the wealth of the Church a disposition to receive an 'Italian Reformation,' is not an unparalleled blindness. But that the general run of Church journals, here and in America, can speak with such nonchalance of the awful, the wholesale sacrilege—the destruction and suppression of monasteries that had stood from the seventh century,—how can we account for it? And that Englishmen, who have cursed the atrocities of the French Revolution, can complacently view such diabolical butcheries as the massacre of Pontelandolfo, to which the Noyades of Nantes, or the Fusillades of Lyons scarcely form a parallel, proves the maxim of the end sanctifying the means to be conveyed in the present day. One question only we will ask.

Can any one deny, has any one attempted to deny, these facts?

The Sardinians and their allies have, on an average, killed fifty persons daily, thus making a total of about 10,000 of the *brigands* and their friends. Setting aside the losses suffered in the six months' campaign which followed the destruction of Gaeta, the combats in the Abruzzi, and the many massacres in other places, the victims of Piedmont must amount, at least, to 60,000. The families of 6,000 officers and 50,000 *employés* are reduced to misery. Skirmishes of all kinds, destruction of grain, dearth of food, increase of taxes, attacks on religion and the clergy, suppression and desecration of convents, add to the miseries of the unhappy country.

And now we would refresh ourselves and our readers by looking away from the poor schism-rent Church as she is, to that which she was intended to be, to that which she will be, as we verily believe, on earth; as we know, in Heaven!

'Jerusalem, quæ ædificatur ut civitas: ejus participatio ejus in idipsum. Illuc enim ascenderent tribus, tribus Domini: testimonium Israel, ad confitendum nomen Domini.

Quia illic sederunt sedes in judicio: sedes super domum David.

Rogate quæ ad pacem sunt Jerusalem: et abundantia diligentibus te.

Fiat pax in virtute tua: et abundantia in terribus tuis!

Art. IX.—1. *Chronicles of the Ancient British Church previous to the Arrival of S. Augustine.* Second Edition. Wertheim and Mackintosh.

2. *S. Paul in Britain; or, the Origin of British as opposed to Papal Christianity.* By the REV. R. W. MORGAN. J. H. and J. Parker.

* 3. *The Cave in the Hills, or Cæcilius Viriathus—Wild Scenes among the Celts—The Alleluia Battle; or, Pelagianism in Britain,* being Nos. I. V. and XIV. of Messrs. Parker's 'Historical Tales.'

4. *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon: the History of the early Inhabitants of Britain down to the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity.* By T. WRIGHT, M.A. F.S.A. Second Edition. Hall, Virtue & Co.

5. *De Ecclesiasticæ Britonum Scotorumque Historiæ Fontibus disseruit Carolus Gulielmus Schöll.* Berolini, 1851.

IF British Church history is obscure, and if almost every current belief about it is an error, it is certainly not for want of writers on the subject. It has suffered, indeed, more than any other chapter in ecclesiastical history, from the combination of scanty evidence, with a more than usual amount of polemically useful legend. Celtic patriotism has combined with Protestant zeal to obscure its native sources to an unprecedented extent with spurious documents and uncertified fables. And the few allusions of foreign writers which afford the chief trustworthy evidence of its earlier period, leave ample room for uncritical supplementing or for baseless theorizing. Roman Catholic historians, from Parsons and Alford downwards, have done their best to construct a case for Papal supremacy out of legends mainly of foreign origin. And as for home authorities, an intelligent sifting of Welsh ecclesiastical documents, in the spirit with which Mr. Stephens has handled those of a secular character, is still a desideratum. While the præ-Niebuhrrian platitudes of Bishop Burgess still seem to hold their ground in dealing with the classical, or rather the patristic, and other (so-called) testimonies to the fabulous British journey of S. Paul.

The abundant crop of recent publications on the subject afford symptoms of a wiser and more intelligent spirit. It is true that even in this nineteenth century the extremes of credulity and of scepticism still seem to meet. A magnificent but somewhat heterodox creation of a mighty Druidical Christian Church, dating from S. Paul, and located in Britain, the great preserver of primitive truth, the independent source of an anti-Italian

orthodoxy, the one intellectual and organized force in the world that could compete with the classical mind, the great co-ordinate element with Greek and Latin civilization ;—such is the vision that possesses the whole Celtic soul of Mr. Morgan,¹ to the sad confusion of his critical powers. In the latter part of his volume, again, the Anglican has superseded the Welshman, and our domestic and Protestant feelings are touched by a family picture, worked out into details almost like a novel, even to the name and church of the family clergyman, in which (but upon the rotten foundation, alas! of menologies and martyrologies) a detailed account of S. Paul's mission to Britain, whence he started, and whither he returned, and who helped to further his journey, is set forth to our wondering eyes. On the other hand, the valuable and learned volume of Mr. Wright, turning aside for a moment from his proper subject on which he speaks with authority, coolly denies the existence of any British Church at all, upon no other grounds than such as (according to the old contrast in Thucydides) would obliterate also Spartan history from that of Greece ; the alleged absence, namely, in this nineteenth century of any material traces of Christianity in the existing antiquarian remains of the third and fourth. We pass by, again, the flat pages of Mr. Thackeray, and the bookmaking precipitancy of Dr. Giles, who have treated us to formal histories (so called) of the British Church, to confess that English imagination has for once equalled that of the Welsh. The localizing of King Lucius at Gloucester, as the first and original impersonation of the perfect theory of Church and State, such is the fruit of the Gloucestershire zeal of Mr. Lysons, who has inherited the tastes of his antiquarian ancestor, but with them also the uncritical swallow of the last generation. Nor can Archdeacon Williams, or Mr. Bowles, or Mr. Lysons himself, establish more than a bare possibility for the parallel story of Claudia and Pudens ; or bring forward that 'almost any proof of it,' which still is requisite, according to Butler's shrewd remark, to overcome 'the presumption of millions to one against' any supposed individual story imagined to have happened. Nay, two worthy Welsh clergymen have literally been found, of whom one, in 1812, affirmed the island to which S. John the Evangelist was banished, to have been Britain itself, while the other,

¹ We stand aghast at the coolness of many of Mr. Morgan's statements. He tells us *e.g.* what happened at the conference of the oak, as if he had been there to see and hear. And throughout he is so very circumstantial, beyond any poor knowledge of ours, that we can only suppose that, in addition to believing literally all he finds in print or in MS. that agrees with his own views, he has also discovered some unknown contemporary historians and biographers. The one merit of his book is his account of Druidical theology, unsatisfactory as telling us nothing of his sources, and so not enabling us to judge when this system existed, and on what authority it rests, but very interesting nevertheless. Historically, his book is ludicrously worthless.

in this very year of grace, 1861, believes in the Somersetshire voyage of Joseph of Arimathæa. But the marks of a more historical and larger temper may be traced in some of the publications named at the head of this article. The excellent 'Chronicles of the Ancient British Church,' though both wordy in style and open to historical criticism, and omitting the larger half of their subject, viz. the post-Saxon period, are a decided improvement upon Mr. Williams' 'Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Cymry,' which itself is a book to be named with respect. And Messrs. Parker's 'Tales,' Nos. I. and XIV., avoiding, for the most part, the prosy inventiveness of those (from the pen of Archdeacon Evans) which preceded them, depict, with a very large amount of careful and self-controlled historical accuracy, the two eras in the history of the earlier British Church, which are the turning-points of that history, and about which we have most knowledge, or least ignorance. While Mr. Blight has done a humbler but even more useful service, by supplying us with a portion of the facts which lie at the foundation of the case, in an elaborate account, illustrated by excellent engravings, of the wonderfully copious Christian remains in Cornwall.¹ The German writers err, no doubt, on the side of scepticism. M. Schöll actually dissolves S. Patrick himself into a myth. Yet his careful and vigorous inquiries have, perhaps, given more real impetus to the study by the fresh spirit they inspire into it, than could be accomplished by any actual enlargement of our knowledge. He has certainly put us upon the right track for the due estimate of our witnesses. Of other foreigners, *e. g.* of Münter, it is rather matter of surprise that they should know so much, than that want of familiarity with a country not their own should betray them into error. And Münter in particular, where he is in error, has been mainly led into it by trusting to the strangest of all books wherein to find a really learned ecclesiastical inquiry, Toland's 'Nazarenus.' If the Englishman confounded the twelfth century with the sixth and seventh, and the Irish opponents or correspondents of S. Bernard, or Malachi, or Archbishop Lanfranc, with the immediate followers of S. Patrick, the German may be excused for following his lead. And, after all, the few pages of another German, viz. Lappenberg, on the subject, are more pregnant with solid, accurate, and intelligent knowledge than most of the laboured works of even Englishmen. One native work, however, claims still the pre-eminence. From the entire accumulation of modern writers, we must fall back to this day upon the old and won-

¹ It appears by Mr. Blight's valuable publication, that there are no less than 185 crosses still remaining in Cornwall. The singular chapels in the same locality occupy his attention also. And Mr. Haslam's valuable labours on the same subject should not be forgotten.

derful book of Archbishop Ussher, whose omniscience swept together almost all that was in his days to be found of print or MS. upon the subject in hand, while his shrewdness and deep learning anticipated and avoided pretty nearly all the errors that have misled one or other of his successors.¹

The truth is, that until the labours of such scholars as O-Conor, and more recently, Dr. Reeves (and they have scarcely touched the *foreign* department of the subject), the attention of British writers had been devoted almost exclusively to the præ-Saxon period of British Christianity, and in that period to the legends mainly respecting its origin, and to the attempt to unite or dis sever it from the Christianity of Rome. Credulity seized upon a statement respecting the Apostle of the Gentiles, which is only so far better grounded than a like statement respecting S. Peter himself, in that an Eastern writer of the seventh century is, as an evidence to such a fact, somewhat less absurd than one of the tenth. A superficial knowledge, stumbling over and misapprehending the difference between the Roman and British Easter-cycle, blundered into a more rational-looking conjecture, and traced the genealogy of the British Church, whether through Lyons or not, to S. John and Asia Minor. And the ingenuity of most writers on the subject has been wasted accordingly upon laboured arguments directed to that most impossible of historical tasks, the creation of evidence that does not exist. Meanwhile, the really instructive portion of Celtic Church history—that which follows the Saxon invasion—and the real body of evidence which that portion of it affords, not, indeed, to an opposition to the Papal supremacy—such an anachronism in controversy would defeat itself by implying the existence of the claim to which an opposition was necessary—but to a simple unconsciousness of it;—all this has been almost forgotten, or only cursorily and inaccurately noticed, or, indeed, to most English students simply unknown. A Scot was a name looked up to with reverence throughout the whole north-west continent of Europe, in the sixth and seventh centuries, by Christians of every grade. A Scotch (a term extending to Ireland and Scotland both, not excluding Welsh Bangor either)—a Scotch education was that which was then sought by those who would become learned divines, by Franks and Burgundians, as well as by native Celts, nay by Anglo-Saxons, and that, too, of the Wilfrid school. A national character, and a certain line of thought, and feeling, and a peculiar rule of life, and writers of their own, and abundant other characteristics are in this period

¹ Dr. Hook could have escaped almost all his many blunders respecting the British Church, had he turned to Ussher. The archbishop's book is the most perfect specimen extant of an exhaustive collection of the whole facts of a case intelligently handled.

traceable upon sufficient evidence; scanty and fragmentary, indeed, compared with the full daylight of later times, but enough to supply tangible and instructive results. And the Scot or Celtic Churchman becomes an important character, to whom the historian can assign a definite image and form upon his canvass. The history of the Celtic Churches becomes worth studying, because by this time it is a history, and not a mere collection of fragmentary allusions to the bare existence (or little more) of a Church at all. Yet, from this really interesting part of the subject, English writers have turned away, and idle debates about futile legends have taken the place of a real history of a living and native Church.

To attempt to sketch the subject here indicated would far exceed the limits of the present paper, yet enough may be said to call attention to it. The history of Columbanus has taken M. Montalbert across a portion of the same ground; and foreign Church historians have been led to the foreign part of it, partially and incidentally, by their subjects, as *e.g.* Mabillon in older times, and more recently Hefele, in his 'History of the Introduction of Christianity into South-west Germany;' but abundant materials still remain to be gathered; and it is a pity that it does not engage as a whole the undivided labours of some English student of Church history. The documents on which it is founded would find their appropriate place in any documentary collection relating to the British Church.¹ And many, no doubt, still lie concealed in German or Swiss, or other foreign libraries. It would be a task that would repay the inquirer, to divert his attention from the proverbially legendary matter that constitutes at present Welsh and Irish history (so called), whether secular or ecclesiastical, and to collect and digest the real history of the Celtic Churches, both at home and abroad, when in their prime.

We distinguish, then, in tracing the *origines* of our native Church, two sharply-contrasted periods. Up to the time of the departure of the Romans, such Christianity as existed among us, weak at best, and scantily spread, appears to have been confined mainly, if not exclusively, to Roman settlements and Romanized natives, and to have struck, in consequence, but feeble roots in the land. It was foreign, not native; it was confined to the Roman provinces of Britain itself; it had no

¹ The British portion of Wilkins' 'Concilia' is among the most crude and incomplete of any part of the work. It would be a great improvement to any future edition of the book merely to recast this portion of it. It would be a still greater, if practicable, to add such documents as illustrate the history of the later Celtic Churches. A large collection was made of foreign evidence upon the subject, from the Vatican, and from S. Gall, among other places, for the use of the Record Commission, which is still lying unused in London. Pity that materials, so inaccessible in general in the libraries where they lie hid, should have been laboriously collected, simply to lie idle.

strength or character of its own, but was a feeble reflection of its Gallic sister across the channel, from whom almost certainly it was derived. Its history is confined almost to the mere fact of its existence, or is, at best, a skeleton of dates, filled up almost by negatives. It was a Church, up to this period, which had produced no one known writer except Pelagius and the semi-pelagian Fastidius; and of these the first certainly, and almost certainly the second, lived and wrote abroad;—a Church which had contributed nothing beyond a silent vote to any ecclesiastical movement whatever, and had lain open to the subtle machinations of the metaphysical Easterns, through the simplicity of her ignorance;—a Church, the first utterance of whose voice, when she found one, was in the form of the fiercest possible denunciations of her own shortcomings and of those of her people, in the well-known complaint of Gildas;—a Church that had hitherto sent no missions; for even Palladius, Patrick, Ninian, who date also at the very close of the period, were sent by S. Martin of Tours and by the Bishop of Rome;—a Church which, when assailed by heresy, was compelled to send to her neighbours for a fit champion of the truth;—a Church that looked to Gaul for the saints whom she should follow and reverence, and by whose names she should call her sacred buildings, Hilary, Martin, Germanus, and whose own almost single saint was only a convert and a martyr in the same day, if his story indeed can be trusted at all—a Church that has left a trace indeed (we affirm it against Mr. Wright), but the very faintest trace of her two centuries and a half of existence, in brick or stone, in sculpture or in inscription:—a Church too poor to endow even her own bishops;—a Church which, so far (it was different afterwards), had no traceable customs or ritual peculiar to herself;—a Church which, in a perhaps happy obscurity, on the one hand, escaped persecutions with but one probably small exception;² but on the other

¹ The special customs traceable at a later time, the peculiar Latin translation of parts of the Bible of which the existence is discernible through Gildas' quotations, and those of the Confession, &c. of S. Patrick, and the well-known though perpetually mistaken peculiarities respecting Easter and the tonsure, are all referable solely to the natural effect of isolation from other Churches—that is to say, there is nothing, or next to nothing, in them bearing internal evidence of being derived from other Churches. With respect to the Easter Cycle and the tonsure, this is demonstrable. It seems to be the case with the other points also, although the Bible translation, singularly enough, contains passages seemingly agreeing with a translation used by Lucifer of Cagliari. One is at a loss to see any possibility of connexion between Britain and Sardinia.

² The evidence of the life of Germanus, written before 500, and of Gildas and Venantius Fortunatus about two-thirds of a century afterwards, appear sufficient to establish the *fact* of the martyrdom of S. Alban, probably about 303. The extent of the persecution in England is exaggerated by Gildas, merely by his unauthorized transfer of the language of Eusebius unchanged to his own pages. The position of Constantius, and the evidence of Sozomen, sufficiently establish the fact that in England there was hardly any persecution at all.

(omitting, indeed, the heretic Pelagius), formed no school, threw no new light on the truth, supplied no commentaries on Scripture, devised no religious or charitable institute, added nothing of any kind to the common stock;—such is the view which a reasonable criticism gives us of the Church of Britain up to the Saxon invasion of her shores. Small trace, so far, either of a special offshoot of the peculiar Asiatic school with which S. John's name is associated, or of a Church lighted up with a blaze of light through contact (as Mr. Morgan will have it) with the one Western centre of the primeval faith, more impregnated with truth than the Jewish faith itself, with Druidism! Far more consistent is it with historical indications to suppose, that the British Churches were simply offshoots of the neighbour Churches of Gaul, and that they had not, up to this date, spread largely among the native population, but had been confined mainly to the poorer class of that mixed race of immigrants which clustered round the chief Roman colonies.

A very different picture meets the inquirer in the subsequent period. Turn to the pages of Gildas, and we find there plain traces first of a National Church. The inconstancy, the headlong impulse, the hasty outbursts of frantic wickedness which he imputes so roundly, are the faults of a Celtic people. One could not desire a better proof of the genuineness of Gildas (assailed, like that of his Church itself, by Mr. Wright) than the agreement between the society which he depicts and that which Welsh legends and history, *e.g.* the *Liber Landavensis*, describe in details. And that Church, again, is one spread over the whole nation, organised, endowed, having churches and altars, the three orders of the ministry, monastic institutions, embracing the people of all ranks and classes. It had spread, moreover, into Ireland and Scotland, and into Brittany. It was also a learned Church. It had its own version of the Bible—its own ritual. Its learned men even knew Greek, so far at any rate as to make bad Latin worse by a sprinkling of Greek words. Look again yet further than Gildas, and the Celtic Churches have taken a more distinct and a far nobler position still. They have become in the sixth and seventh centuries not only the Church of the people and land of all the British isles, including gradually within the sphere of their influence almost the whole of Saxon as well as Celtic England; but they are now the leading Churches of northern Europe, the great centre of learning, the prolific hive of missions, and the focus of devotional feeling for all Christians north of the Alps, except where Italy still kept an opening for herself through the southern portion of France, and by the help of the Catholic Franks. They have assumed, from the outward tonsure to the inward spirit, a substantive and vigorous character of their own. It is

dangerous to speculate upon the issues of contingencies that have not happened. Yet Church historians cannot be far wrong in saying that a mere turn of the scale, humanly speaking, prevented the establishment, in the seventh century, of an aggregate of Churches in North-western Europe, looking for their centre to the Irish and British Churches, and as entirely independent of the Papacy as are the English-speaking Churches of the present day. The Celtic skull and the Celtic temperament, we are told by naturalistic ethnologists, are perforce Romanist. We commend the fact to notice, that the largest and most powerful combination of European orthodox Churches not paying obedience to the Roman See at any period anterior to the Reformation, consisted of the entire aggregate of the Celtic Churches existing at the time, with the addition of a body of Celtic missions among Teutonic tribes.

A few words will sketch, though very imperfectly, the outline of the important part then played by the Churches (as they have been called) of the British Confession. From the middle of the fifth to the middle of the ninth centuries (c. 450—850), a combination of Churches arose, culminated, and finally melted into the Communion of their opponents, differing from the then Roman Church in ritual, but not in doctrine; having drifted, indeed, by mere lapse of time into such divergences as inevitably result from discontinuance of intercourse, but nothing more: having their own Liturgy, their own (in part at least) Latin translation of the Bible, their own mode of chanting, their own monastic rule, their own missions, their own succession of bishops, lastly, their own old-fashioned but erroneous cycle for observing Easter; unconscious, at the time of the severance,¹ of any submission due to the bishops of Rome, and unhesitatingly repudiating it when circumstances brought it before them;² and (as their legendary lives of saints show,) gazing

¹ The statement of Giraldus Cambrensis, that the synods of Llandewi Brefi and of Viotry, which, according to the common story, suppressed Pelagianism in Wales in the sixth century, were confirmed by the authority of the Roman Church, is relied upon (e.g. by Kunstmann) as proving the submission of the British Church to the Pope in that century. It simply proves that the Britons looked up to Rome in the days of Rhyddmerch in the tenth century, whose 'Life of S. David' is Giraldus' sole authority, the latter having done no more than translated Rhyddmerch's bad Latin into (as he conceived) an elegant style—a style, by the way, about as much superior to Rhyddmerch's as would just constitute the difference between being rejected or not at an Oxford examination of the present day. But in Rhyddmerch's time, Bishops of S. David's had come to look for consecration to the Saxon Archbishops of Canterbury, and of course looked up to the see of Rome as much as they did. And, beyond doubt, the anti-papal attitude of the Britons, A.D. 600, which rests upon Bede and other indubitable testimony, is quite enough to show that the two words on the subject in Rhyddmerch ('Romana auctoritate') represent his own feeling and no more. Indeed, his 'Life of S. David' is a pure legend throughout, and is historical evidence, therefore, in respect to the writer, but not in respect to his subject.

² Columbanus professes respect to Rome as 'Caput Ecclesiarum,' but 'salva loci

fondly back to that which had formed the cynosure of Christian eyes at the time when Barbarian conquest first cut them off from southern Christendom, viz. to Jerusalem and the Holy Land, rather than to (although not to the exclusion of) the apostolic threshold of Papal Rome. The great break-up of Roman Gaul in the middle of the fifth century, which thrust a barrier of savage Paganism between the general community of Christendom and the British Isles, and as a part of the same movement the Saxon invasion of Britain itself, mark the commencement, as they formed the causes of the ecclesiastical phase of which we speak. The great Irish monasteries, and the triple catalogue of Irish saints upon which Ussher comments, and S. Columba and the Culdees of Icolmkill, with, in a less degree, the half wasted churches of Wales and Cornwall, constituted its heart, and the centres of the Christian life which radiated from it. The mission of Columbanus (c. 590), and shortly after of S. Gall, and of many other Scotch missionaries, to Lorraine, Franche Comté, and Switzerland, and the all but complete absorption of Anglo-Saxon Christianity into the Scoto-Irish Church, prior to the Conference at Whitby in 664, were its culminating points. The colonization of Brittany (c. 450), the foundation of the Irish monastery of Bobbio, near Pavia, among the Arian Lombards by Columbanus (c. 600), the Scotch monasteries at Ratisbon and Vienna,—the brave missions of holy men unnamed on earth to Faroe and to Iceland—and the establishment of a British colony and a British bishopric, occupied by Mailoc, in Spanish Galicia (c. 570), a kind of Gibraltar geographically, though in no other sense, to the British Churches,—point to its furthest local extent. And while the names of Wilfrid and of Theodore mark its decadence in Britain, and that of Boniface its more violent suppression in Germany and Switzerland; yet traces of Irish feeling linger on in Brittany, and in France generally, until at least the beginning of the ninth century, if not later,¹ while in Ireland

Dominicæ Resurrectionis singulari prærogativa. In other words, he places his relation to Rome in the same category with his relation to Jerusalem, and reckons both to be simply entitled to reverence, not to canonical obedience; and even so, Jerusalem first and Rome second. And no one can read Columbanus' letters without perceiving that the idea of the papal supremacy in the modern sense had never entered his head.

¹ The decree of Louis le Debonnaire respecting the Breton Abbey of Landernech in the beginning of the ninth century, marks the date of the absorption of Scotch or British monastic rule and tonsure into the Benedictine in Brittany. But in southern France the white robe of Columbanus is usually but erroneously said to have given way to the black robe of the Benedictines, and with the garb all other peculiarities likewise, at an earlier date still. Mabillon, indeed, dates their disappearance in Columbanus' own (Italian) Abbey of Bobbio, as early as 628, but upon evidence that does not by any means bear out the inference he draws from it. As regards France, Lappenberg cites a respectful mention by the French bishops of the *Hospitalia Scottorum* in 846. And Joannes Scotus, at the end of

the fusion of the Churches was not complete until the Norman Conquest of the country by Henry II., some four hundred years later. Externally measured, the extent of the non-Roman Communion thus described well-nigh balanced that which remained on the Roman side. For Ostrogoth and Lombard Arians in succession overran Italy itself during nearly the whole of the sixth and seventh centuries, and Arian Visigoths occupied Gaul first, and then Spain, for a considerable portion of the same period; leaving the Catholics in Italy and Spain, and the Churches of the Frank kingdom and of the now (after 517) Catholicised Burgundians, and later still (597), the Anglo-Saxon mission, and we suppose we must throw in Illyricum, to form the entire Papal Communion in Europe. But the internal by no means corresponds to the external parallel with modern divisions of the European Churches, above suggested. The absence at that time of any doctrinal or essential difference, and the externality of those differences which existed—the weight of superior civilization in both arts and literature thrown wholly into the scale of Rome,—imperial as well as ecclesiastical associations, attaching themselves to the same side—the power of centralization belonging to the Papacy, but wanting to its rivals,—all combined with the course of political events (as *e.g.* the rise of Anglo-Saxon and of French power on the two sides respectively of the Channel), to give a different issue of the contest from that, which a different chain of conditions prognosticates, we hope, for its modern reproduction. But the value ecclesiastically speaking of the position which these Churches occupied, does not depend upon the success with which they maintained it. The fact still retains its force, that they had been simply unconscious of Papal claims at the period of their isolation. And, like the unburied sculptures of some Ninevite mound, the attitude in which they are found upon their renewed contact with the world without, affords unimpeachable evidence of their real ecclesiastical position at the time when they were first shrouded in the obscurity of their northern tomb from the eyes of southern Europe.

Various theories have been devised to account for the position thus occupied by the British Churches. M. Schöll, out of his own head, supposes a substitution, in the fifth century, in the place of the older British Church, how accomplished he does not say,

that century, is a proof in his own person both of the respect paid to Scottish learning still, and of Scottish claims to that respect. (We cannot forbear transcribing, by the way, for our readers' amusement, the account of Scotus given in a recent compendium of English history :—'He resided in the court of Charles 'the Bold. He was afterwards made by Alfred, head of Brasenose and was at last 'assassinated by robbers in Malmesbury Abbey.') Single immersion in baptism, which is conjectured to have been a Scotch or British practice, lingered on in Brittany until the seventeenth century—so Martene informs us.

of a new Christianity derived from the East. The general current of writers, except Roman Catholics, encouraged by supposed polemical reasons, push back this alleged oriental foundation to the earliest original of any British Church at all; and mainly through a pure blunder respecting the British Easter controversy, conjecture a mission to our shores from Asia Minor. And while writers like Parsons and Alford, or even Lingard and Kunstmann, try to make polemical capital out of the apocryphal story of Pope Eleutherus and King Lucius, those of an opposite school, in the supposed interests of Protestantism, have clutched at the equally baseless story of S. Paul's visit to Britain. And now comes Mr. Morgan, though largely ignorant of the actual facts of Celtic Church history, but with, as far as we know, an original theory, to claim for the Druidical element the credit of this non-Roman independence. Unfortunately, not one of these hypotheses accounts for the facts of the case, and not even the least wild among them rests upon reliable evidence, or is consistent with the evidence that exists. Neither an Eastern, nor a Papal, nor a Pauline, nor a Druidical origin will account for the phenomena of a Church, that had no Eastern customs, knew of no canonical subjection due to the Pope, differed in no way doctrinally, or in the first instance ritually, from European Christendom in general, was singularly free from metaphysical speculations, and though given rather to those practical views which developed into Pelagianism, yet originated no special doctrinal views of her own, true or false, upon any subject whatever. While of evidence to support these several theories we must affirm that there is simply none.

A fair survey of what is really known, will show, we believe, that the more natural supposition of the simple spread of the Gospel from the Gallic Churches to their British neighbours, modified as time went on by the successive historical conditions of the British people, is the only reasonable result, and a perfectly adequate explanation, of the whole of the facts.

We turn, then, to the earlier portion of the history we are considering, with the purpose of reviewing concisely the real amount of that evidence upon which our modern writers dilate at such full length, and build such airy palaces. If a review of British Church *history* would take us rather to the far more interesting field we have above indicated, a review of British Church *historians* must call back our attention to the duller and more disputed period of which we first made mention.

The earliest reliable testimony to the existence of a British Church at all, is to be found in the words of Tertullian, c. A. D. 208; rhetorical, no doubt, but sufficiently precise to show the writer's belief, as in a well known fact, that there were then Christians in Britain. The passage, however, was probably

written at a time when the Emperor Severus was engaged, but had not yet succeeded, in quelling a British revolt. And the phrase, *Romanis inaccessa loca*, therefore, does not affirm the existence of Christianity external to what had been, and shortly was again, the Roman province, but simply that Christian missionaries had succeeded, where Roman soldiers, at that moment, had failed. Some twenty years subsequent to Tertullian, Origen repeats a like testimony more than once. But it is at the same time stated, in a homily attributed to Origen, and at least not of earlier date, that the Gospel at that time had not even been preached to the greater part of the Britons—*plurimi* (among the Britons, as well as other nations, such as the Moors) *nondum audiverunt evangelii verbum*. From the time of Constantius Chlorus and the year 300, it becomes superfluous to dwell upon testimony to so indisputable a fact as that of the existence of a British Church, of some extent or other. Even if Mr. Wright persists in requiring the literal bricks and stones of Christian churches or monuments, we trust to satisfy him before we have done. But for more reasonable inquirers, the list of authorities in the note¹ will amply suffice. We rather hasten to reply to the less preposterous question, how we come to deny the existence of evidence to such a Church earlier than Tertullian?

The absence of evidence is, in itself, a sufficient ground for withholding assent from any historical theory. In the present case there appears to exist, also, counter evidence to disprove that theory. Of course, no one would take upon him to affirm, that no single Christian man found his way to Britain before the year 200. The legitimate conclusion from the evidence is simply, that there was no formed Church there before some date close upon that year. Now there are one or two statements of good authors which appear to prove this. Irenæus, for instance, about A.D. 176, enumerating the several Churches of Christendom, and dwelling with some particularity upon his own neighbours, knows of Churches in northern and western Europe only among the Germans (the *Germaniæ* of the Roman Empire), the Iberians, and the Celts. And the latter term in Irenæus, as in Cæsar, means indisputably, not the Britons, but exclusively and properly *Gallia Cel-*

¹ Act. Concil. Arelat., A. D. 314, ap. Labb. I. 1430; Constantini Epist. ad Eccles. ap. Euseb. Vit. Const. iii. 17, 19; Euseb. Demonst. Evang. iii. 5; S. Athanas. ad Jovian. Imperat. (Op. II. 761), Apol. c. Arian. (I. 123), Hist. Arian. ad Monach. (I. 360); S. Hilar. Pictav. de Synodia, in Prolog.; Sulp. Severus, Hist. Sac. II. 55; S. Chrysost., c. Judeos (Op. I. 575, Montf.); Serm. de Util. Lect. Script., in Epist. ad Cor. II. Hom. XXVIII., Serm. in Pentecost. (possibly spurious); S. Jerom., Ad Evangelom (Op. IV ii. 803), Ad Heliodorum (ib. 267), Orthod. et Lucif. Dial. (ib. 298), Ad Ctesiph. adv. Pelag. xliii. (ib. 481), Ad Paulam (ib. 551), Ad Paulinum (ib. 564), Ad Oceanum (ib. 662); Palladius. Hist. Lausiac, cxviii.; Theodoret, Philoth. xxvi., De Legg. ix.; Prudentius, *Peri Srepharon*, xiii. 103. We might enlarge the list considerably from writers further on in the fifth century.

tica, Irenæus' own locality, and the known seat, at that time, of many Churches; though (if we may trust the traditions respecting the Lyonnese persecutions, which are not likely to fall short of the truth) of none, at that time, further north than Langres. Sulpicius Severus, again, a late authority (A.D. 400), but of some weight respecting Gallic history, asserting the well-known Lyonnese martyrs of what he calls the fifth persecution (166—179) to have been the first martyrs in Gaul, explains his statement by the remark—'serius trans Alpes Dei religione suscepta.' And if not 'across the Alps,' then much less across the British Channel. The best evidence, indeed, postpones the entire christianizing of even Gaul to the middle of the third century. On the other hand, the obscure words of Gildas, assigning the introduction of the Gospel into Britain to the reign of Tiberius, upon which so much ingenious criticism has been wasted, and which are repeated, *usque ad nauseam*, by every compendium writer of English Church history, are simply (as Ussher hints, and M. Schöll proves) an extension of certain words of Eusebius, unwarranted by the original, so as to include Britain within their scope. Gildas himself, writing in the sixth century, avowedly knows nothing of the early history of the Church of his own country, beyond what he had found, or fancied he found, in foreign writers, and mainly in the Latin translation of Eusebius; for the simple reason assigned by himself, that all native documents had perished in the Saxon troubles. And as the water cannot rise above the fountain-head, so the silence of Eusebius, when we look to his own words, cuts away the ground altogether from his copyist's mistaken amplification of them.

But if general statements thus fail those who would ante-date British Christianity, still less can they rely upon circumstantial legends respecting individuals. We can scarcely hope, indeed, to lay the ghosts that have so long troubled the minds and disturbed the imaginations of patriotic and controversial historians; yet an attempt at really sifting evidence may effect something for truth in the present critical days. During the first two centuries of the Christian era, then,—1. Apostles, or apostolic men, are represented as preaching in Britain, and specially S. Paul. 2. British Christians are spoken of as in Britain itself. And, 3. either in Rome, or at different places in Gaul, or even Italy, conjecture, or mistake, or legend, has localized Christian Britons. We would fain hope, in spite of symptoms to the contrary, that the historical spirit has been so far cultivated among us, as at least to allay the storm of indignant moral reprobation which the denial of each and all of these stories is too likely to conjure up.

1. A patriarch of Jerusalem, in the year 629, Sophronius,

brings S. Paul to the shores of Britain. There is literally no earlier real authority for the story. A poet, Venantius Fortunatus, about 580, alleges that the Apostle's *pen* came thither, not himself;¹ evidence which would prove S. Cyprian, also, to have been a British missionary, for his pen, likewise, according to another Christian poet,² 'Gallos fovet, imbuit Britannos.' The vague rhetoric of Theodoret (in one passage of his writings) and of Eusebius, of whom one specifies the Apostle, but not the country, and the other names the country, but not the Apostle—a second passage, in which Theodoret speaks of S. Paul preaching in certain islands in the sea, meaning obviously Crete—the purely rhetorical verbiage of S. Jerome and S. Basil—prove simply nothing. And the well-known phrase of S. Clement, read by the light of S. Paul's expressed intention of journeying to Spain, would never have been quoted to prove a visit to Britain, except in the interest of a foregone conclusion. Those who maintain such a visit must, of course, find room for it in their chronology of S. Paul's life. To ourselves, who believe that there is simply no evidence for the story, it is superfluous to enter into chronological difficulties. Neither need we stop to argue its improbability upon other grounds; as, for instance, the absence of any traces of S. Paul's presence in the intervening Churches of Gaul, where in truth none existed for a full century after the supposed journey. The story must first of all have feet to stand upon, before it can be needful to waste time in knocking it down.

The visits of other Apostles to our shores (and there are no less than six, including S. Paul, for whom a claim has been put in) are equally destitute of any real ground to rest upon. The best authorities for them are such writings as the spurious *Synopsis Dorothei*, where we find, by way of measure of its historical value, one 'Cæsar, Bishop of Dyrrachium,' included among the 'seventy-two disciples,' on the authority of S. Paul, in Philipp. iv. 22; or the veracious Simeon Metaphrastes, or the Greek Menologies; sufficiently heavy weights, in point both of date and of internal credibility, to drown any statement respecting the early times we are now considering, to which their names alone are attached. A like fatal interval between the alleged fact, and the date of the witness, destroys the possibility of accepting Aristobulus, Celticized into Arwystli, as among the apostles of Wales. The authorities are the so-called Dorotheus above mentioned (and we have seen what that book is worth) and the Triads; the latter, by the very locality which they assign to him, as well as upon other grounds, belonging of necessity to a period considerably after Britons had become

¹ So Lingard.² Prudentius.

Welshmen, in the modern sense of the name, and, therefore, at the very least, four centuries and a half after date, and probably two or three centuries later still. We trust Mr. Morgan will forgive us, if we leave him, undisturbed by obtrusive argument, to his pleasant dream about Joseph of Arimathæa.

2. But what of that first of Christian kings, Lucius, or Lles, or Lleurwg, or Lleuer mawr, the premier patron of an Established Church, the great transformer of Flamens and Archflamens into Bishops and Archbishops, the prototype of the genuine Erastian form of regal supremacy, or, on the other side of the question, the correspondent and convert of the Pope, and the dutiful son of Rome? Shall we be forgiven, if, forced by the stern canons of evidence, we pronounce him a mere Roman invention of the fourth or fifth century, first dressed up into shape in Wales, in the eighth or ninth? The earliest traceable mention of such a personage is in the short biographies of the Popes, known as the *Catalogus Pontificum*. In the earliest form, indeed, of this *Catalogus*, coming down to 353, there is not a word on the subject. But in the next edition, so to call it, coming down to 527, one line is interpolated about it into the life of Pope Eleutherus, expressed in language so thoroughly of the mint of Roman writers of the beginning of the fifth century, as to betray its origin at once. Compare it, *e.g.* with Prosper's account, about the same date, of the missions by the Popes of Germanus and of Palladius, to England and Ireland respectively. And the peculiar phraseology employed enables us to trace the course of the story, as well as its birthplace. Bede first of all, learning it probably from his ordinary sources of Roman information, introduced it into England; his usual authority for British Church history, Gildas, being ignorant of the tale altogether. About a century or so afterwards, the so-called Nennius blunderingly repeats it—the first native authority that does so, unless the Triads preceded him, as possibly (accepting Mr. Stephens' verdict) the earliest of them may precede him by a few years. Thenceforward, legend is busy with the hitherto bare statement. And in the *Liber Landavensis*, and in the monkish stories with which William of Malmesbury adorned his 'Glastonbury Antiquities,' and still more in the vivacious pages of Geoffrey of Monmouth, it comes out at length in full bloom. It yet remained for a later and, if possible, clumsier forger to concoct the letter of Pope Eleutherus, and to thrust it, of all the odd places in the world (among, however, other purely legendary matter relating to Wales and its connexion with Saxon neighbours), into a kind of Appendix to the Laws of Edward the Confessor. Yet the impudence of the fiction finds really a shadow of excuse in the credulity which, even in this present year wherein we are writing, repeats the

myth of King Lucius' butler, and at least appears to believe as possible the veracity of the brass tablet, which, before the Great Fire, chronicled the hoar antiquity of S. Peter's, Cornhill. We need not go on to consider whether it be best, with Stillingfleet, to localize our imaginary king in wild and un-Romanized Sussex, or with most authors, agreeing with Welsh legends, in Glamorganshire, or with some romance writers of our own time, in Gloucester. Time enough, too, to adduce the analogies of Herod and Mithridates, or, nearer home, of Cogidunus, and other tributary kings, allowed to cling under the shadow of Rome to a precarious independence, when it is first shown that there is a tittle of reason for believing that our particular British tributary ever existed at all. Assuredly a fancy, or a blunder, or a fiction, picked up at Rome sometime during the fifth century, and translated into the language which seemed to a Roman biographer of Popes to be appropriate to his own ecclesiastical views, is not evidence on which to ground an historical statement, relating to an event in remote Britain, dated three centuries and a half before.

Of yet earlier candidates for the prerogative of premier Christian of Britain, such as Bran the Blessed and his family, we are equally constrained to pronounce a verdict of not proven. Traditions of the sixth or seventh centuries at the earliest, and probably of later date still (we refer ourselves to Mr. Stephens for the assertion), cannot establish as historical facts family histories of from five to six hundred years previous. It cannot, indeed, be pronounced impossible, that there could have been an isolated British Christian in the first century. We simply say, that there is no proof of the existence of such a one, while there is ample probability of the origination of fictions of the kind during the centuries from the fifth forwards, so prolific, among the Welsh, of ecclesiastical, as indeed also of other legend.

3. Turning our eyes across the Channel to continental and Southern Europe, we are met first of all by a family tale so touching, that it is cruel to disenchant the inventor from his dream by the cold chill of criticism. The family of Pudens and of Claudia, the Roman noble and the British princess, united in their grand Roman palace by the ties both of earthly marriage and of spiritual brotherhood,—their sons and daughters by name and history, each in turn martyrs for the faith,—their very parish church by name, and their parish clergyman by name, all complete—opening their hospitable doors to S. Paul, and forming a starting point for his mission to the lady's native land,—pity that so fair a tale should lack the one element necessary to convert a romance into a history. We turn to facts, and certainly a Pudens and a Claudia are coupled by S. Paul, and

a Pudens and a British lady Claudia are at a later date coupled together as husband and wife by Martial in certain epigrams; and though a less interval by a couple of generations would have made the identification easier, it is yet possible, by help of various suppositions, that the two pairs may be one and the same. It is true, further, that Pompina Græcina, the wife of an ex-governor of Britain, was accused and acquitted, A.D. 57 (Tac. A. xiii. 32), of a '*peregrina superstitio*,' which there is nothing to hinder, and nothing to prove, to have been Christianity; and that her husband, who had something to do with the Rufi, seems possibly to have borne some distant relationship to Claudia Rufina. It is true, also, that an inscription found at Chichester records the donation of the site of a heathen temple by the son of one Pudentinus, four letters alone of the donor's own name remaining, viz. 'ente,' conjectured by antiquarians, e.g. Horsley, to stand for Pudente; and that Cogidunus, the British prince, who assumed in honour of the emperor the name of Claudius, and is therefore supposed to have something to do with Claudia, occurs in the inscription also, as the dedicator of the temple. So far, we stand upon a few fragmentary facts. The connecting of these facts together, and the building out of them of a single story, is simply guess or legend—the unauthorized conversion of what physically might have been, into what actually has been, or the downright invention of a credulous age. Later martyrologies, in which the strangest blunders are mixed up with uncertified stories, form the sole direct testimony to any part of it.

But if classical writers yield a scanty return to our search, there is an abundant harvest derivable from untrustworthy compilers of the sixteenth century, if quantity could compensate for worthless quality. Unfortunately the four or five Britons traditionally claimed as founders, or bishops, of as many continental cloisters or churches in the first or second centuries, whom the omniscient diligence of Ussher has raked together—Beatus, the founder of Unterseven, on the Lake of Thun, Mansuetus, Bishop of Toul, Marcellus, first Bishop of Tongres and then of Trèves, Cataldus, the founder of Tarentine Christianity—to whom we may add Mello, Bishop of Rouen in the third century—rest upon no reliable authority; are in the first four instances dated at a time long preceding the possible existence of Christianity at all at the places assigned; and are, in a word, so entirely imaginary, that we should not have mentioned them, had not Mr. Morgan raised upon the assumption of their reality, one of his airy and pretentious superstructures of so-called history. Mello, too, the one among such shadowy possibilities who has the best evidence for his existence, is precisely the one about whom Mr. Morgan says nothing.

Sweeping away then the whole of the confused heap of legends which have thus overgrown the true history, we are limited by the scanty existing evidence to the end of the second century as the earliest date of a British Church at all. A few lines, to fill in the picture, and render it a little, though not much, more than a bare skeleton, are all that the remaining fragments of evidence will allow.

I. First, it seems to be undeniable, that the British Christians, until towards the departure of the Romans, were to be found in Roman settlements, and were drawn from Roman settlers, or from the population connected with them. There are only scanty traces of Celtic Christians, and none at all (of a trustworthy sort) of a Celtic Church beyond the Roman limits, until the close of that period. The British bishoprics, when named (as in 314), belong to the capitals of the Roman provinces: to York and London certainly, and almost certainly, also, to Caerleon—*Colonia Legionensium*.¹ British martyrs, so far as the accounts are trustworthy, belong to the same Caerleon and to Verulamium; and their names, Albanus, Julius, Aaron, are certainly not Celtic. The few other names preserved, however, include some of Celtic nationality, as Eborius, for instance, the somewhat suspicious name assigned to the Bishop of York in 314. Of his colleagues on that occasion, Restitutus and Adelfius, the latter may possibly be identical with Cadfrawd, as Rees supposes ('Welsh Saints'), just as Pelagius is supposed to be a translation of Morgan. But other and common Greek names occur in the Martyrologies, *e.g.* Socrates; and are just those we should expect to meet with, if the Christian ranks were recruited most largely (as is probable) from Roman slaves and freedmen. Celtic names, indeed, occur, mixed with Latin ones, on Cornish tombstones; but these are mostly of a date when the British Church had become undoubtedly the Church of the native Britons. It is a much stronger fact than the scanty evidence of a few names, that we find all the antiquarian remains of British Christianity, as the churches or crosses, for instance, at Canterbury, Dover, Richborough, Lyminge, Porchester, connected distinctly and exclusively with Roman stations, and almost wholly clustered in the original Roman corner of the country.² It is to be noticed, also, that Lappenberg has been misled by Ussher into his assertion of the existence of British translations of the Bible. There is no evidence for such translations in the alleged passage of S.

¹ *Colonia Londinensium*, as the original text now stands, is not seemingly more different from *Col. Legionensium*, than from *Col. Lind.*, or *Lindicolinum*, *i.e.* Lincoln; and the external evidence, from the unbroken tradition which names Caerleon, the capital of the then third Roman province, as the third British archiepiscopal see, in conjunction with York and London, seems conclusive for Caerleon.

² The few other existing remains are connected with Roman localities.

Chrysostom.¹ And a Latin translation, in many parts peculiar to Britain, was current in the time of Gildas. We assume, then, the original British Church to have been distinctly connected with Roman domination in Britain; and in estimating the importance of this fact, we must remember, upon the undeniable evidence of language, how little real hold Roman occupation had upon Britain, and in what comparatively scanty numbers Roman occupants settled or sojourned there.

II. And the British Church, accordingly, at this period was plainly of limited extent and narrow means. Wherever Roman settlements in Britain lasted for any length of time, there Roman remains occur, and usually in no small abundance. It has been remarked long since, with surprise, that while heathen inscriptions, and altars, and statues, and tombs, occur by hundreds, traces of Christianity are of the rarest possible kind. Along the whole line of the great Roman Wall from the Tyne to the Solway, one altar, out of many hundreds of different kinds of heathen remains, has been supposed, and erroneously supposed, to be Christian. At Bath, the second great repository of Roman antiquities, the question has not even been raised. At Cirencester, a couple of coins of two Christian emperors prove nothing. Putting aside Cornwall, where, among abundant Christian British remains of later date, there occur also a Christian tombstone or two, probably of Roman times; setting aside also Wales, where we believe there are no Christian antiquities of earlier date than the sixth century, unless a questionable Roman tombstone, half Pagan, half Christian, discovered lately at Caerleon, be allowed as an exception; we are reduced to the remains of the churches above-mentioned,² to a pair of dubious mosaics—at Horkstow, in Lincolnshire, and Frampton, in Dorsetshire—Pagan far more than Christian, to an inscription on a tombstone now in Lincoln, which also was originally Pagan, and to a few miscellaneous articles found in Yorkshire and Northumberland. The existence of any of such remains is enough to disprove Mr. Wright's universal negative. The existence of so few is enough to prove conclusively, that the Church of Britain in Roman times was not the Church of the rich or the noble, or even the Church of the people, but was

¹ He speaks of Britons not as reading the Scriptures themselves, but as discoursing upon their contents—*τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς Γραφῆς φιλοσοφούντων*—in their native tongue.

² With respect to British churches, the frail and transitory nature of their material should be borne in mind. Those of which any remains are preserved to the present time, were of Roman building. The stone church of Candida Casa, and the other of Paulinus, at Lincoln, and the glass, and lead, and architectural ornaments of Wilfrid, were a double step in advance of the original British buildings. The wooden edifices of the later British and first Saxon churches were durable, compared to the wattle and mud walls of their first edifices.

scanty in numbers and poor in wealth. The acceptance of the imperial allowance, at Ariminum, by three British bishops alone, out of the entire body assembled, points to a like conclusion. Nor need we stop to notice the alleged multitude of British martyrs in the Diocletian persecution, when the real question on the evidence is, whether that persecution affected Britain at all.

III. If we turn from its secular to its ecclesiastical position, this poor and feeble, and not yet naturalized, Church, appears in history as simply following the lead of the Western Church in general, and specially of the Gallic. The Gospel, in the first instance, appears to have come in contact here (we are sorry to differ *toto celo* from Mr. Morgan's Druidical dreams) with no special school of philosophy, with no profound or intelligent faith external to itself, and introducing new ideas into the Christian mind, with no great mental powers of any kind. Under the term of 'the Gauls,' we find Britain sometimes politically included with its opposite neighbours; and ecclesiastical ideas of its importance seem to have followed a similar line. Setting aside altogether the Arianism imputed to the Church of Britain by Gildas, as supported by no other evidence (as usual) than a misapplication of Eusebius, while it is conclusively negated by express testimonies of S. Athanasius, S. Chrysostom, Jerome, Sozomen, down to the synodical letter of the Council of Aquileia in 381,—we find British bishops silently counting as units in all the acts and fortunes of the Western Church; assenting to the Paschal among the other decrees of the Council of Arles in 314; assenting expressly (though probably not present) to both the faith and the Paschal decree of the Council of Nice; joining in the acquittal of S. Athanasius, at Sardica, in 347; ranked as orthodox, in 358, by S. Hilary of Poitiers, whose devoted admirers they were, in common with their Gallic neighbours; yet hesitating for a time, with the rest of the unmetaphysical Westerns, over the term *ὁμοούσιον*; beguiled into unintentional Arianism, perhaps at the Council of Milan in 355, but certainly at that of Ariminum in 359; yet unhesitatingly adhering again to S. Athanasius and to orthodoxy in 362. We would gladly believe them to have been at Nice, were it probable. But although the existing lists are corrupt, and therefore not conclusive, yet the universality of Constantine's invitation, extending, according to Eusebius, to all bishops everywhere, is obviously too weak a premiss to prove the actual presence of the bishops of a particular country, even though that country be one in which Constantine had a special interest; especially as Eusebius, in the same passage, evidently contemplates Gaul, not Britain, as forming with Persia the Dan and Beersheba respectively of

the Churches of the time. While Gelasius of Cyzicum raises a strong counter-presumption, if he can be trusted, by telling us that, whereas copies of the Nicene decree were carried usually to their respective countries by the bishops of those countries, the copies for Britain, among the other Western Churches, were borne by Vitus and Vincent, the Roman presbyters, under the direction of Hosius. The like undistinguished course continues onward into the fifth century. The very mention of Britons usually arises from the geographical or rhetorical motive of singling out one of the extremest limits of the Church. And thence alone it is, that we find them specified, for instance, in S. Jerome, or Palladius, or Theodoret, as meeting their ecclesiastical antipodes, the Persians, not at Rome only, but at the then common centre of Christian patriotism, at Jerusalem—visiting the holy places, sharing with others the hospitalities there dispensed by the bounteous Lady Melania, or gazing with awe, as they traversed the neighbouring Syria, upon Simeon on his lofty pillar.

The evident dependence of the early British upon the Gallic Church, leads to a like conclusion respecting the original insignificance of the former, and its lack of individual character. That dependence is evidenced in many ways. The leading Gallic bishops, from the beginning of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century, Hilary of Poitiers, Martin of Tours, Germain of Auxerre, successively sway the British Church as absolutely as their own. We have seen how Britain looked to S. Hilary's guidance in Arian times. In the Pelagian controversy they had the like recourse to Germain and his brother bishops, Lupus and Severus. And the dedication to S. Martin of churches at Canterbury and at Whitherne,¹ the only two known British dedications of Roman date, and the express testimony of Venantius Fortunatus, and the watching of S. Columbanus for five nights, and afterwards of S. Senanus, at the tomb of S. Martin, and the keeping of S. Martin's *Dies Natalis* in Ireland, and numberless other facts of a like kind, which may be found in Dr. O'Connor's pages, prove how enduring and deep the feeling was with respect to him. The mission of S. Keby to Wales by Hilary, that of Ninian to Whitherne, and of S. Patrick to Ireland, in connexion with S. Martin, show that even British missionary zeal, up to the fifth century, needed to be kindled and instructed from Gallic sources. And to this must

¹ The numerous dedications to S. Martin of existing English churches—there is a S. Martin's church in every one of the older cathedral towns in England south of (and inclusive of) York, if we except Rochester, and accept Leicester in lieu of Lichfield, besides very many others, from S. Martin's Isle among the islands of Scilly, to Martindale in Westmoreland—are of course, at the earliest, of Saxon origin.

be added the fact, that the erroneous Easter cycle of the subsequent British Churches was precisely the cycle of the Gallic Sulpicius Severus, drawn up about 410, and retained by them in the isolation which shortly afterwards cut them off from Southern Europe, while Rome gradually amended her own cycle from time to time, beginning with Victor of Aquitaine, about 457, in order to bring it into harmony with that of Alexandria. The Gallic psalter, again, was that used in Ireland, as Ussher tells us, on evidence drawn from Sedulius, a writer of the end of the fifth century; although, on the other hand, it is evident, from Gildas, that the Roman psalter was current in Britain some half-century later. That the British liturgy was borrowed from the Gallic, is simply an inference, although a probable one, from the connexion between the Churches, and cannot therefore be alleged in proof of that connexion; while the peculiar customs common to both, which are commonly alleged (the anointing of the *hands* of presbyters, for instance, at their ordination, mentioned by Gildas), appear rather to have been borrowed by the Gallic, through the Saxon, from the British liturgy itself, at a much later period. But the fact needs no aid from doubtful sources. If anything is certain of the older British Church, it is its relation of dependence on the leadership of that of Gaul.

IV. The revolution wrought in the British Churches in the fifth and sixth centuries is palpable. Its nature and its cause afford the only ground for dispute. One might assume the probability of an extension of the Gospel to the native population by the fifth century. It is certain that the British Church was that of the nation in the sixth. The impossibility of tracing any bishopric in England at all, except the two at London and York, or any Welsh bishopric except Caerleon, to an earlier date than the first half of the sixth century, and the complete identification of all British ecclesiastical tradition with Wales exclusively, save in the two cases where Saxon Christianity preserved or restored it, viz. Glastonbury and S. Alban's, fall in with other evidence to prove, that the identification of the Christian Church with the nation dated but a short time before the period of Saxon inroads. On the other hand the language of Gildas is a full proof of that Church's nationality in the midst of this period. During the generation or two preceding that historian (so to call him), *i.e.* at the close of the fifth and beginning of the sixth century, the Church of Britain manifestly had become Celtic in its character, and pretty well coextensive with at least a large portion of the island south of Tweed. And the language of Constantius in his *Life of Germanus* carries up both statements to the yet earlier date of the beginning of the fifth

century, while Saxons were as yet merely foreign robbers and not settled in the land. Its extension to Ireland and Scotland, the introduction and wide spread of monachism within it, its reputation for learning, its band of saints, the foundations, in a word, of its subsequent greatness, date roughly from the same period. And if the existence of controversy and the conflicts of the truth with heresy are a proof of life, that proof also is to be found in the tenacity with which Pelagianism, although Britain was not its birthplace, nor a Briton its originator,¹ yet clung to these islands after it had been crushed elsewhere. The disputed question is, whence this change arose. Was it the result of an Eastern connexion, original or subsequent? or of Druidism? or simply of the natural growth of a Church, thrown upon its own resources, purified by suffering, vitalized by its own missionary efforts, marked indeed (as time went on) by peculiarities arising from isolation, but otherwise deriving strength and character from having become the Church of a wide-spread race, which was destined, it is true, to succumb before the more practical sturdiness of the Teuton, but was full, nevertheless, of a vigorous and characteristic life of its own? We have no hesitation in closing with this last supposition. That Druidism coloured the later Welsh Christianity, is both probable, and is indeed shown by such semi-pagan productions as Taliessin's to have been the fact. And it is quite possible that the Pelagian doctrines may have derived some additional strength from kindred Druidical tenets. On the other hand, it is very hard to say, how much of what passes for Druidism, was really borrowed and distorted from Christianity itself. As one element, however, in Celtic belief, we have no desire to dispute the possible truth of Mr. Morgan's assertion of its influence upon the British Church. All we affirm is, that, except in a few fragments of semi-pagan Welsh poetry, and perhaps in its possible affinity to Pelagianism, such influence is untraceable. The Eastern theory boasts of more and greater names in its support. Yet no theory ever was more baseless. In one sense, indeed, every Church in the world is Eastern. Even in a more precise sense, the Western Churches, including Rome, were Eastern. They were in the first instance Greek in character and speech, and two centuries at least elapsed, before 'the Latin tongue became Christian.' It is true also that the Church of Lyons, to which geographical considerations attach the probable origin of that of these islands, derived its origin

¹ Pelagianism found, no doubt, a heresiarch and a name in a British monk, and that heresiarch a coadjutor (probably) in an Irishman. But neither Pelagius nor Celestius originated the heresy. It was imparted to Pelagius by Rufinus, a Syrian, and not in Britain, but in Rome.

from an Eastern source different from that equally Eastern source whence was derived the Church of Rome. But the British Eastern theory, if it means anything, means that the British Church stands distinguished from all other Western Churches by some peculiar and independent Eastern origin—connected with Jerusalem by some, by others with more shadow of reason with Asia Minor and S. John,—sufficient to account for alleged peculiarities in that British Church itself. It rests upon no ancient evidence.¹ It is simply a modern conjecture. It is a theory devised to account for those peculiarities. And if every one of these turns out to be the product of home-growth, and to be widely different from the ways of any Eastern Church whatever, the theory falls to the ground at once. Now such is undoubtedly the case. The British Easter cycle is the main support assumed for the theory. That Easter cycle, if we look to the facts, simply followed the cycle employed by the Western Church, and specially by the Church of Rome, even in its errors, up to the beginning of the fifth century, and then remained stationary in the erroneous form which Rome had at that time adopted, while Rome herself learned better things and accommodated herself gradually to the greater astronomical wisdom of Alexandria. It is a proof, then, of connexion with Rome, not of the contrary. And it agreed neither with the Quartodeciman view of the earlier Asiatics of Asia Minor, nor with the Alexandrine rule which governed the Eastern Church in general after the Council of Nice. The British mode of tonsure, which is a second point, leads to a precisely similar conclusion. It was as different from the Eastern as it was from the Roman tonsure, and obviously grew up among the Celtic Christians without any copying of other Churches, Eastern or Western. The Eastern tonsure, indeed, never came to British shores at all. And if S. Patrick did really introduce the Roman fashion into Ireland, it was, at all events, speedily supplanted by the Irish. The peculiar and independent monastic rule of Columbanus was equally of home growth, so far as any monastic rule was so in the West. Monastic institutions altogether were originally from the East; and Eastern rules were introduced into the West; and S. Basil's rule, which some have fancied the source of that of Columbanus, penetrated, among numberless others, into Gaul, and as far north as, *e.g.* Limoges, although in conjunction there with the rule of

¹ Bishop Colman, of Whitby, in 664, did not claim an Eastern origin for the Scotch or British Church. He merely asserted, and that incorrectly, that the Scotch kept Easter in the same way as S. John had done. Macpherson is the earliest writer in whom we at this moment remember to have noticed the conjecture. It is put forward by him as a conjecture, and upon the ground of the usual blunder about the British Easter.

Cassian, and was common enough in Italy, we are told, after its appearance in a Latin translation. Up to the time of Benedict, there was, in fact, a multiplicity of rules in Western monachism, mainly derived from Eastern sources, but modified by Western founders of monasteries. The Scotch or Irish rule, or rules, may well have been drawn, as were those of Gaul, from Eastern sources, in combination with Western alterations; as, indeed, is expressly asserted of the rule introduced by S. Patrick into Ireland. But there is not a shadow of evidence for any connexion with the East in the matter, peculiar to Britain or to Ireland. Pelagianism, again, has been connected, even by such an historian as Neander, with this alleged Eastern character of British Christendom. Yet surely Pelagianism was distinctly the heresy of the practical common sense of the Western Church, as much as the metaphysical and unpractical subtleties of Arianism belonged to the Eastern. The præ-Augustine and Eastern fathers Pelagianized, if they did so, only as writers might who wrote before the question was broached. The Western Church, and that alone, embraced and retained and was divided by the heresy, as by one akin to its habits of thought. The Greek crosses found in Cornwall,¹ may be accounted for by the general intercourse of the Church as a whole. And distinctive British peculiarities of ritual are so vaguely known, as to afford no ground for saying more than that, at any rate, nothing peculiarly Eastern appears in them.² But if the ground thus breaks away from all the alleged proofs of this Eastern origin—*cadit questio*—there is no more need of argument to disprove that origin. The theory was invented to account for the facts; and if the facts not only do not harmonize, but hopelessly disagree with it, there is an end of the matter. We will only add, in conclusion, that the independent position occupied by the British Churches with respect to Rome, and maintained by them when Rome had advanced her pretensions, and strove to interfere with it, presents a much stronger argument against the Papal supremacy, if held to proceed from a Church simply Western, and differing in no way in point of origin from the Gallic Church or the Spanish, than if, in order to its validity, we deem it necessary to characterise the claimant of it as a Church of another order, and springing from an independent source.

¹ That found in 1829, in S. Cuthbert's grave at Durham, was *not* there when the tomb was opened in 1104, and is conjectured by Lingard to have been placed there for safety at the time of the Reformation.

² We do not know on what authority Döllinger affirms the British Church to have used unleavened wafers at the Eucharist, while the Church of Rome used leavened bread.

No. X.—*The English Cathedral of the Nineteenth Century.*

By A. J. B. BERESFORD HOPE, M.A. D.C.L. With Illustrations. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1861.

It has been said that many of our best and even standard works have owned an occasional and accidental origin. Their authors did not, after the German fashion, sit down of a set purpose and with premeditated malice to write a formal and systematic treatise. Some local controversy, some chance occasion, some incident or accident of the day, stirred the writer's mind, and perhaps what is in fact, and for all practical purposes, an exhaustion of a single subject is the result. Especially has this peculiarity of our literature been observed in the later English theology. A threatened conversion or perversion of a single and not remarkable woman, set Laud to write on what at last came out as a complete work against the claims of Rome, though it still bears the oral form of the original dialogue. Hooker's masterpiece grew out of a very small purpose. Almost all Bull's works were occasioned by small circumstances. Wall's volumes grew out of a personal dispute. The book before us resembles in this respect of its *genesis* many books with which it would be an honour to compare any production of a living pen. From a letter in a newspaper and a lecture delivered before a local Society, has grown Mr. Beresford Hope's volume, which, as far as its title promises, may be said to be complete. There is something satisfactory in a volume of this informal character, and the reader seems to be present as at some process of nature. There is the germ gradually developing its organs and accessories: there is the island slowly rising from its nucleus of rock or coral, and gradually clothed with vegetation: there is the molecule stage by stage rising into higher organization. A book in which you can trace the natural developments of this sort has a natural aspect. It predisposes the reader in its favour. Mr. Beresford Hope is a natural writer. His first thought can be traced, a solid unity: and round it is a natural accretion of subjects fairly growing out of it. His subject is the English Cathedral of the Nineteenth Century, and he is led to examine it in its two aspects, the material cathedral and the moral cathedral.

At first sight there seems to be here not so much a comparison of terms as an ambiguity. But the same may be said of the term Church, which the systematic writers treat under its double aspect, *Ecclesia in sensu morali*, and *Ecclesia in sensu*

materiali. Our American cousins, with an affectation of precision, have avoided what they consider an ambiguity by inventing the ugly term 'Church edifice' for the material Church. The germs of Mr. Beresford Hope's double treatment may be found in the two primary documents out of which his book was moulded. The moral or social or political use of a cathedral he treated first of all in a very able and comprehensive letter which he printed in the *Times* newspaper in December, 1857, under the popular title of 'The Work of the Church among the Millions,' reprinted at p. 6 in the present volume: and the sketch of an ideal English Cathedral in its material aspect he elaborated in a lecture delivered last year before the Cambridge Architectural Society. These two documents are the foundation of the present work, which treats the cathedral as a building and an institution. In this notice we shall follow this division.

Mr. Beresford Hope has earned the right to instruct us on this subject under either of its aspects. Skilled above the ordinary accomplishments of an amateur in architecture, the present author has added to an inherited taste a vast amount of information patiently gathered and luminously surveyed in practical art. But Mr. Beresford Hope is no *dilettanti* student. He has shown by a life of service to the Church of England, that he is not a mere æsthetic and pedantic art-critic. He has not worked at architecture as men do in entomology or botany. He values the material Church but for its spiritual significance and practical use. In his life and works he has earned a title to discuss subjects of this grave importance. He knows quite as much of Church work, Church necessities, and Church grievances, as he does about middle pointed and French pointed. His book is concerned with Church extension in either sense of the term; and his eye is as keen to detect a blunder in administration, as a solecism in mouldings or tracery.

To express summarily his view on the adaptation of Church work to large towns, his thesis is, that a large church, with a staff of associated workers, is the better method than the planting of little independent benefices by the sub-division of parishes. He is perhaps somewhat reticent and chary in announcing this view in all its boldness; but this is what he means. The form in which he finds this more practical organization for town missions is in the cathedral. Of course we are thankful for the inquiry in this form; but it seems to be somewhat a forced and strained necessity to connect this subject with the cathedral only. A cathedral is not necessarily a large church; nor by the force of terms does it imply any Church work at all. A Dean and Chapter, or Canons, or associated

clergy, are not necessary to a cathedral; and we could have all the work done which Mr. Beresford Hope wants done, without a cathedral at all. In other words, a cathedral need not be a large church; and a large church, and large work, frequent and solemn services, and a body of working clergy, does not necessitate a cathedral. A cathedral is merely the church in which the bishop's house or cathedra or a little chapel is fixed. This may be a wooden hut, or a canvass tabernacle; and a centre of missionary work may be in a town which is not a city. As a mere matter of history, Mr. Beresford Hope is right in tracing the evangelization of a country from certain defined episcopal centres, each of which implied of course a cathedral, because a bishop must set up his throne somewhere; and he is correct in observing that these episcopal centres threw out parochial divisions, and the scattering, as it were, of independent parish priests. But a cathedral can only effect what our author requires to be done when it is also a collegiate or chapter church, and the collegiate church is not necessarily an institution in any sense to be identified with a cathedral. A collegiate church is in fact what Mr. Beresford Hope requires, though for convenience sake he treats it under the common term cathedral. We do not by any mean intends to say that this distinction has not been present to the writer's mind. But his title hardly does justice to the fulness of his materials. The book contains much more than it promises; it not only says, as the late Lord Herbert said in a valuable pamphlet, how existing cathedral institutions may be utilized, but what is the especial way of dealing with the want of the times. This is shown by the origin of the letter to the *Times*. It was occasioned by the opening of Westminster Abbey, followed by that of the Cathedral of London, for what are called special services. These special services were the answer which churchmen made to the taunt that so many thousands followed Mr. Spurgeon; and were the alternative offered by the existing system to the Exeter Hall services, to which Mr. Edouart offered a well-meant but technical resistance.

At this point and crisis Mr. Beresford Hope writes his letter to the *Times*. It is a very characteristic and able one. Mr. Beresford Hope's mind is a political one, and his parliamentary training has taught him that art, so difficult for very earnest persons like himself to acquire, what not to say as well as what to say. He had a difficult work before him in his letter, which was not only to discredit the Spurgeon mania, not only to say but little in favour of the Westminster Abbey services, then in the first flush of their popularity; but, with an eye to conciliate the readers of the *Times*, to say what he could even for Lord

Shaftesbury and the Exeter Hall committee. We must congratulate so good and tried a churchman on his success in this delicate task. What he says in substance is, that the desire to hear great preachers was not an unnatural thing, or one to be disregarded; that the desire shown by the originators of the Exeter Hall services to bring religion 'home to the masses,' was in itself a most commendable thing; but that it was not fair to leave such a work to the desultory energies of an accidental committee. That the Church itself was the best committee, and the diocesan and cathedral idea the natural centre, from which extensive operations, such as great town missions, including special services, should be derived. That the proper constitution of the Church was a balance of the cathedral and parochial systems. That the strict incisive theory of the parochial system would be sure to break down, as it had broken down, in large towns, and that instead of attempting to go on with the subdivision of parishes, it would be better to think of a co-operative agency and a consolidated mission and associated clergy. Not that all of this was said by Mr. Beresford Hope in his letter; nor is every word of it to be found in his published volume. But here is an extract which may be taken as a favourable specimen of his matter and manner:—

'When we consider the condition of spiritual destitution to which the combined action of a rapidly increasing population and an unelastic law of parochial subdivision and endowment had reduced England at the commencement of the century, and compare it with the activity which characterises, in various measures, almost every part of the Church at the present day, we can only exclaim, "It is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes." But it would be a foolish and hurtful optimism to suppose that the actual system was the complete panacea for all the spiritual wants of the nation. Excellent as the parochial system is in so many ways, it yet must tend, if unmodified by other agencies, to a disjunctive and separatist, rather than a co-operative and harmonising order of things. The church with its incumbent, the school with its teacher, are admirable, each in its own sphere; but if neither of them is to be drawn upwards in itself, nor towards its own similarly-placed neighbour, by the proximity of some more exalted exemplar, each will be apt to trail upon the ground within a limited circle. If there is no harmonising principle at work to blend the local idiosyncrasies of each little centre, every such small community will be apt to become a law to itself in defiance of its neighbours, or else to lose heart and energy from the absence of that encouragement which a superior and regulating organisation can alone afford. I need no further proof of my position than the practical working of that well-known measure of ecclesiastical reform, Sir Robert Peel's Act. This act was passed to remedy an order of things which called for legislation, and it has proved in many respects a blessing to the Church of England. Greater facilities were unquestionably needed for the subdivision of parishes than already existed, and these the act provided upon the broad and intelligible principle, then for the first time admitted into our Parliamentary legislation for ecclesiastical matters, that the creation of the cure of souls was of more importance than the completion of the material fabric, and that the new autonomy ought, therefore, to date from the endowment of the incumbent, and not from the building of the

church. That Sir Robert Peel's Act has, however, proved an unmixed blessing, no man, unconnected with the Ecclesiastical Commission, would, I should think, be bold enough to asseverate. The week's contents of the waste-paper basket of any person supposed to be bountiful towards Church purposes, would give the most complete and pointed reply to such an assertion. There are, in truth, few more melancholy records of difficulty and privation, manfully, I believe, and Christianly borne up against as the general rule, than that interminable series of circulars, printed and lithographed, by incumbents of destitute Peel districts which are ever passing and re-passing through the post-office. The same story, with a few variations, runs through them all. The church is either unbuilt, and Divine Service performed in some wretched, pestilential, unsuitable hole, or else it has been built with a debt which is breaking the backs of all who have taken part in that good work. Then comes in the regular reference to the church-rate, and we are either informed that the rate has been refused for years past, as the new church stands in a populous place, or else it is levied for the benefit of the mother-church, and the new institution gets nothing at all, or much less than its right proportion. Then there is no school, or the school also is insolvent, while the incumbent finds himself reduced to that most painful and detrimental of acts—namely, to proclaim the personal indigence of a gentleman and often of a gentlewoman to the ears of strangers. In the meanwhile, the poverty-stricken district cannot be effectively worked, even in proportion to the means which it has scraped together. A morning spent in posting urgent appeals even in behalf of God's house, is a bad preparation for preaching God's word in that house. Besides, the single-handed clergyman is physically unable to work his natural resources to the uttermost. The best head and the best lungs must often flag, under the incessant physical fatigue of public ministrations in a populous district carried on without change or assistance. The clergyman soon discovers that his public services, drawn from a jaded and insufficient source, are becoming vapid and forced, and he feels that the attendance runs the risk of speedy diminution. If we add to this the wear and tear of home visiting and such ministrations, the toil of keeping up the schools, and the petty harassing details of clubs and other miscellaneous calls upon the clergyman's time and energy, we cannot hesitate to own that the underpaid and unassisted minister of a Peel district in a town, who tries to do his duty, stands in a false and impossible position, and that his success or failure is no criterion of the real strength of the Church of England if properly set in motion. The evil is increasing day by day; and if the religious world is not timely wise, there may some day be a terrible crash and collapse of character and influence, not to say a general catastrophe of material reverses. The Church is on its trial in more ways than one in the Peel parishes, for in no long time the authorities will find that it is impossible to persuade men of education and proved character, such as the ideal Church-of-England clergyman ought to be, to shipwreck fortune, health, and usefulness in whirlpools so obscure and so repulsive as the bankrupt districts; and the result must be that we shall find a body of clergymen without education or social standing foisted into the ministry as stopgaps for the destitute localities. I need not say how grievous a misfortune both to Church and State would be this deterioration of the clerical standard. The evil may perhaps take the form of there growing up two castes of clergymen: one will be the incumbents of vicarages and rectories, men of education, influence, and social standing, out of whom dignitaries will be ordinarily chosen—and the other will be the incumbents of district churches, "literate" who enter holy orders without a reasonable hope of any better material position, and all whose associations, social and professional, will tend to keep them apart, in an attitude of ignorant and dissatisfied hostility, both from the gentry and the university-bred incumbent of the old parishes. If this state of things should unhappily

come about, we shall see in England the repetition in our reformed community of that same disastrous and scandalous feud which afflicted the mediæval Church in the contest of the secular clergy alongside of the ancient monasteries with the newly-minted, and democratic *Fratres*. Perhaps, however, an even worse evil may befall us, and the lean cattle devour the fat. The "literate" may become the typical incumbent of England, and that grand personage, the English clergyman—gentleman and scholar as well as Christian—become a thing of the past.

'I do not, of course, pretend to say that what has been done, even if somewhat amiss, can now be re-constituted on a better basis. Where three puny churches, each with a single ill-endowed clergyman, and a proportionately feeble tariff of services, have been erected in a locality where one large church with a staff of four or five clergy, and constant opportunities of worship at all hours, would have been infinitely more beneficial, and not have cost one farthing more at the onset, then these three churches must, I suppose, be still maintained as a vested interest. But at least we can be more wise for the future in the institutions which we raise up to meet the growing wants of an increasing population, and to palliate, if not remove, the inconveniences of the existing organization.'—Pp. 14—19.

Mr. Beresford Hope goes on to argue that the Cathedral system is the only remedy for this state of things, and he appears to adopt without qualification the recommendation of the Commissioners of 1851, in favour of a subdivision of the English dioceses. But the gravest difficulty of this plan is passed over *sicco pede*, not only by Mr. Beresford Hope but by the gentlemen who recently presented a memorial to Lord Palmerston on the subject. Theoretically no doubt there ought to be an increase of the Episcopate, proportionate to that of the population. But what about the appointment to the new sees? Would a multiplication of the Premier's type, the Palmerston Bishop, be a gain to any religious, social, or political interest? Is there any likelihood that the Government would allow a free election of Bishops? If not, would not cheap Bishops follow the cheap Clergymen whose portraits Mr. Beresford Hope so well draws? The answer to these doubts is to have faith in the divinely appointed order of Bishops. Certainly, nothing but faith in a Divine institution could enable a churchman to endure, say the Hoadlys of a past generation or the Prince-Bishops of another country; but we ought to have, and we have, faith in the divinely appointed order of the priesthood, and yet this faith cannot close our eyes to the evils contingent and actual of that remarkable order of clergy—the semi-socialist and starving incumbents of a poor church in a poor manufacturing town. Nor are we quite satisfied with the suggestion of reviving that odd institution, the diluted bishop, the chorepiscopus of the books. For what the chorepiscopus of fact was few people inquire.¹ Besides the

¹ 'Chorepiscopi non erant Episcopi, nec eorum ecclesiæ erant cathedrales : ' cap. *Ecclesiæ*, 3, dist. 68, ibi : 'Inter Episcopos verum et Chorepiscopos hæc

consideration that an inferior order of bishops would tell on the existing episcopate, we must bear in mind the caution of the old canons, which forbid the extreme multiplication of bishops, *ne vilescent episcopatus*. Mr. Beresford Hope says, that it is conceivable, but most condemnable, that the episcopate should be extended, as in America, without a corresponding expansion of the Cathedral system. We should be disposed to invert this observation, and to reply, that it is quite possible to have all those advantages of centralization, large churches, and frequent services, without any very considerable increase of the episcopate; which, without such guarantees as we are scarcely likely to gain, would be a very problematical benefit to the existing Church. Having arrived at this point, Mr. Hope connects the second part of his work—the material, with the moral element. The Cathedral system is the right centre of Town Mission. A cathedral is not necessarily a very large or expensive affair. Cathedrals have been recently built in the colonies, or projected for the colonies. Here, he adds, is a list of them: these were built to meet certain needs of the colonists, felt and recognised. Those needs are our own. Why should we not try a remedy which has been found useful elsewhere?

Our only difference with Mr. Beresford Hope is a verbal one; and we might say, that as all he wants might be done without the increase of the episcopate, and that a new cathedral cannot exist without a new see, all this portion of his work is practically a misnomer. The cathedral idea is not necessary to the fulfilment of his ideal: a collegiate church would be quite enough. But passing over this minute criticism, we are thankful that a layman so valued and trusted as Mr. Beresford Hope, has spoken, though so cautiously, and with such wise and respectful deference as he has done, on the great question of Church extension.

The late Bishop Blomfield, with characteristic energy and honesty, took up the problem, and tried to solve it, as he did every difficulty, by what he thought to be common sense. But in this, as in many other matters, commonplace sense is not common sense. The commonplace view of this Church extension is to consider it as an arithmetical sum. If 500 people in the country, or 2,000 people in a town, are enough for one parson to look after, there are given so many people, how many parsons

est differentia: quod Episcopi non nisi in Civitatibus, Chorepiscopi et in Vicis ordinari possunt: Episcopi formatas tribuunt literas, et Chorepiscopi non nisi commendatitias et pacificas dare valent: Episcopi jus consecrandi habent, Chorepiscopi tantum minores ordines tribuunt, Leviticam autem et Sacerdotalem benedictionem non valent præstare.' Ferraris, *Bibliothec. sub voc. Episcopus*. The Chorepiscopi had not the power to ordain, nor to consecrate churches, nor to confirm, nor to use the chrism, nor to reconcile penitents. The Chorepiscopi were, in fact, little more than rural deans.

do we want? If a town church holds 1,000 people, how many thousands are there in London without Church accommodation, and how many churches shall we want? This was Bishop Blomfield's method. This was what he approximately aimed at. But the very enunciation of such a problem condemned it. It was absolutely impossible to get either the men, the churches, or the money; and this the late Bishop of London lived to find out. But if he could not do everything, he could do something; if he could not build a brazen wall, he could stop a gap in the hedge here and there. So the Bethnal Green churches were built, and cheap churches were built about the suburbs; and something was done to overtake the daily increasing hordes of irreligion and vice. And at first some success was achieved. The first incumbents of these new churches were often men of energy, and sometimes of means; but that energy being but of flesh and blood, was not immortal; those means were not those of Fortunatus; and somehow, Bishop Blomfield could not face a failure. He complained of his tools when his principle was wrong. He did not always encourage men in difficult positions, though few sympathized so warmly with those who were, or who said they were, successful. And so the great scheme of Church extension in London languished, and before the death of the late Bishop, it may be said to have passed out of official hands into those of private energy. Here and there a splendid church has been erected by private munificence, but the Metropolis Churches' Fund died of absolute inanition before its exemplary and excellent founder. Bishop Blomfield lived to see the rise and extinction of parochial subdivision on the old scale, and according to the old idea. That idea was that of the infinite divisibility of matter. Dichotomies were to be dichotomized *ad infinitum*. But a moral problem cannot be solved by material methods of this sort. When, as among ourselves, the principle of private judgment, self-dependence, personal choice, or whatever else it is to be called, has got head, minds are not to be governed by an order in council. When the district churches are built, it is impossible in towns to force the parochial system. People will go to church where they choose, not where they ought to go according to the Church theory. But it was with the clergy of the new districts that the break-down was most complete. Some disdained the arts by which popularity was to be won: and some were incapable of attracting their parishioners either by life example or power; and when the late Bishop of London, by deserting those of his clergy who stuck by him on his charge of 1842, showed that it was the best policy to defy him as the Islington clergy did on that memorable occasion, he found some difficulty in manning his new churches, or at least

in getting successors to his first incumbents. And we mention London only, because it fairly represents the system of minute subdivision of parishes. The plan as long as it lasts is this: Get a young and enthusiastic clergyman; set him down single-handed to build schools, compel him to do the whole work of the church, and keep up all its institutions, its lectures and library and night schools: let him have a wife and family, which gives a respectable air to the institution, and a Peel district and 150*l.* per annum. And this may be done once. A curate is always found to take a new church. He generally has small means, great spirits, and good principles. In a few years he is used up: the orange is sucked, and goes the way of all sucked oranges. And if this were all, the consequences would be rather favourable than otherwise to the Church. As the blood of martyrs is a fertilizing shower to the Church, so a succession of used-up incumbents is not without its moral effects. After all, to be ruined in health and pocket in a Peel district is in itself a kind of confessorship; and as to mere suffering, the axe and the stake are not perhaps so hard to endure as the daily cross of accumulating debts and difficulties which at last submerge the poor Peel incumbent.

But the evil does not stop here. There is likely enough to arise another race of clergy, who are resolved not to spend and be spent after this tame and inglorious fashion. If from experience it has been found that the new churches and new parishes did not work well, perhaps the fault was in the men, not the system. Had we got hold of the right sort of men? This is the present cry, and we are to go on another tack. To deal with the masses—this, we believe, was the recognised formula—we should have men of the masses. The university man, with his refinement, and scholarship, and traditions, and social standing, is not fitted for this rough work. As diamond alone cuts diamond, so rough work must be done with rough tools. We want a cheap and rough-and-ready clergy. This is the last invention of the day,—the very newest form of ‘evangelizing the masses.’ As is the moral principle, so is its formal and material expression. The school church—half lecture-room, half preaching-hall, one-tenth a house of prayer, and nine-tenths made up of the place of assembly for the multiplication table and the rifle drill—is the fitting accompaniment of prayer and sacraments accommodated to the spirit of the times. This is what is coming of what is now the prevailing fashion. This new method contains half a truth. It is quite true that we want men more than churches, and we want an elastic system; quite true that parochial subdivision is not enough. The churches, if properly used for various services at various hours,

are not so insufficient after all. We do want men rather than churches.

Other evils of the district churches have not been slow to show themselves. The faults of these small independent churches, with needy incumbents outbidding each other in the religious market, and underselling each other in pews and schools, and, as was actually the case in one notorious instance, in a tariff of fees, are patent enough. So is the personal rivalry of neighbouring perpetual curates. But the evil does not stop even here; not only is the clerical *status*, but the clerical *morale* lowered. Premiums are held out to uneducated *alumni* of the cheap colleges to enter into holy orders, and all the evils of the Mendicant orders are introduced into the purer and reformed branch of the Church. It is a rise in the social scale for a linen-draper's clerk to become a reverend gentleman, and there will never be wanting candidates for the ministry if you lower the standard. But these recruits bring into the army of the Church not only the manners but the moral tone of the class which they represent. A socialist English clergy is no remote possibility. In the middle ages the Mendicants always headed the social *jacqueries*, and the brethren of the free spirit were popular favourites because they represented and encouraged the popular discontent with endowments, settled income, and landed inheritance. We deprecate the coming of that day, or the triumph of those principles, which shall encourage the rise of such an element in the clerical hierarchy of England. When clergymen clamour for the equalization of the poor rate, or take up the cause of the costermongers against the law, they forget that they are playing the game of socialism.

Undoubtedly Mr. Beresford Hope deserves thanks for touching, with however light and graceful a hand, these plague-spots in our system. There is only one difficulty which he has not met. He pleads forcibly for associated town missions, as against the system of small and independent, and desultory, and often hostile efforts. But he has scarcely taken into account the fact that, as regards England, the evil is not of recent growth. The great collegiate church has been always a comparative stranger in the quiet towns of this country. It is a historical fact that our cities, unlike those of the Continent, always abounded in small, independent churches and parishes. London, before the Fire, possessed separate churches and parishes in the closest proximity. Many of the old London churches were within fifty yards of each other. York, Norwich, Exeter, Bristol, Lincoln, exhibited the same facts. The English mind was always adverse to centralization; and the late Bishop of London, and Dean Hook, had at least the strong argument of precedent in their favour. In

Paris, or Lyons, or Antwerp, there was always the collegiate system at work; and their few vast churches, with an ample body of clergy, and a full supply of frequent services at all hours, contrasted curiously with the insignificant little churches of York, each with their solitary priest, and a single mass. Nor was this English idea confined to the Church. The local vestry, and the local parish, always exhibited greater prominence here than in continental cities; and the Paris municipality was always more important than the London corporation. And, curiously enough, the Reform era, which swept away the cathedral bodies, or reduced them to insignificance, also destroyed the secular municipal corporations. The two things lived and died together; and what is still more remarkable, in either branch of the social state we seem to have discovered our hasty error. There is a return to the abandoned principle, though very possibly it may take new forms. Mr. Beresford Hope is pleading for the restoration of the cathedral, or, as we should say, the collegiate, system, in our great towns; and in London, the Metropolitan Government Act, and Mr. Thwaites' representative parliament, may be fairly estimated as a recurrence to the associated and co-operative principle in urban municipal government. To such signs of hope, Mr. Beresford Hope, eunymous in every respect, will doubtless recur. At any rate, we owe him all thanks for his honest and able essay, to point out existing evils, and the way to avoid them.

We may now turn to the scientific and artistic, which is also the largest, portion of this volume, and to the consideration of the material cathedral, a subject which few persons are better qualified to discuss than its accomplished author. Before proceeding, however, to examine in detail Mr. Beresford Hope's arguments and conclusions as to the proper characteristics of an Anglican cathedral church for this nineteenth century, we may perhaps express our satisfaction at the practical ability with which he makes his great stores of archæological and technical learning available for the present service of the Church. It is this which so honourably distinguishes Mr. Beresford Hope, and those who are known to be associated with him in his artistic studies, from others who follow the same pursuits with no other view than a barren antiquarianism. There are many who are great authorities at the meetings of archæological associations as to the history, date, and use of architectural remains, but who go no farther than this. They are destitute altogether of the critical and constructive faculties by which they might make their knowledge practically useful. They are satisfied with inquiring as to the exact age of a church, or with investigating the

cloacæ of a ruined castle. So far they may be depended upon; but probably no advice would be less trustworthy than that of these very archæologists on any question as to the restoration of an old church, or the building of a new one. We do not mean of course to include in these remarks such exceptional cases as that of Professor Willis. In him the power of bringing his vast acquirements to bear on the practical revival of Pointed architecture is not absent, but only in suspense and abeyance. Another scarcely less distinguished architectural writer of the same class, Dr. Whewell, has shown in the new hostel which he has added to Trinity College, Cambridge, that he is competent to grapple with the actual realities of the neo-Gothic style. But our present author always gives us the impression of loving Gothic architecture, not so much for its past glories as for its present and future capabilities in the Church's service. Not that he is less able or less zealous than others as an archæologist, but that he is something much better than an antiquary. The Pointed style is to him not merely the most picturesque type of ancient architecture, nor merely the one most nearly associated historically with our mediæval institutions; but it is the form of architecture which he believes rightly to be consecrated to the religious use of the Church of England. This belief, and the hearty endeavour to reduce this faith into practice, has been the salt which has preserved the so-called Ecclesiological school from the moral stagnation of an effete dilettantism. It may be seen in every page of the volume before us. Hence it is that our author is not satisfied with a dead reproduction of the architecturalists of the past; but he is foremost among the architecturalists of the day, whose watchword it is that the Gothic style has enough vitality to be able to adapt itself to every conceivable demand of an improved civilization; while the mere archæologists stand aghast at the introduction of any feature, or the use of any material, or any process, which had not the authority of English mediæval precedent. Mr. Beresford Hope has done more perhaps than any living man, not only by argument but by example, to establish the principle that our revived Gothic may borrow from every quarter, with unmixed advantage to itself, anything which, not being essentially antagonistic, can be incorporated into, or assimilated with, the style. Hence, while there are some who can still soar no higher than the slavish imitation of ancient undeveloped precedents,—who, for instance, would reproduce a mediæval village church in the streets of a crowded city, or copy a 'Perpendicular' clerestory in a tropical or semi-tropical climate,—Mr. Hope, with Mr. Butterfield's help, has shown us, in the remarkable building in Margaret-street, what a Gothic town church of

the nineteenth century may be, while others have solved the further problem of adapting the Pointed style to the requirements of the torrid zone, as in Mr. Bodley's church at Delhi, and Mr. Burges' cathedral for Brisbane, the capital of Australian Queensland. These considerations are essential for our full appreciation of the fearless spirit with which Mr. Beresford Hope addresses himself to the task now before him, of examining the church architecture of the past, so as to develop the true principles which ought to guide the founders and designers of the present and future cathedrals which are, or which will hereafter be, required by the Church of England and its daughter communities throughout the world.

Having shown, upon social and moral grounds, that the actual religious wants of the day call for churches of the size and scale of cathedrals, that is to say, churches of not less than 200 or 250 feet in length, and of other dimensions in proportion, the first point to be determined is, of course, the general architectural style, the outward form and expression of the building. Mr. Hope is perfectly justified in assuming, as he does, that, at least for ecclesiastical architecture, the common consent of almost all bodies of Christians has decided in favour of the Pointed style. But a further question arises as to what specific variety of the style should be adopted. The nature of the choice to be made cannot be more succinctly stated than in the following extract.

'But a further problem still remains to be solved,—whether any existing variety of Gothic (for there are many) ought most preferably to be adopted in the new cathedral? or again, whether the architect ought to invent, or else close with, some specific new variety, composed out of the numerous elements of the antecedent styles? The materials which exist towards the solution of these questions are manifold. The Gothic of the North offers for our choice the Lancet or First style, more slim in England, more sturdy in France, little known in Germany; the Middle or Decorated species, conspicuous for the grace of its window tracery, and ranging from the Alps to the fiords of Norway; the classically regularly Perpendicular of England; and the exuberant Flamboyant of the Continent. Southern Europe, too, has its varieties, not yet so accurately classed, but all of them broadly distinguishable from those of the North. Facility of travel and breadth of study have placed all these within the ken of the architect; while no absolute law of taste or fashion has yet arisen to compel his choice, strongly as he will find himself solicited, on the one side, by the uncompromising partisans of insular nationality, and on the other, by the admirers of cosmopolitan beauty.'—Pp. 30, 31.

Mr. Hope, with characteristic moderation, stands aloof from any extreme view on this subject. While he comes forward as the advocate of what he calls 'progression by eclecticism,' he takes care to distinguish himself from those who would recklessly break with the past in their desire for change. Next he points

out that the English revival of Gothic architecture was strictly national, and he would moderate the enthusiasm of those who seek—not to engraft upon the home stock the congruous beauties of French or Italian Pointed, but—to substitute these foreign types altogether for our own insular variety of the style. Taking the English Middle Pointed, of the period between 1250 and 1370, as the starting-post of our new development—as being the golden mean of ecclesiastical architecture—he would enrich this style with every improvement of which it is capable. From Italy he would borrow, not what is essentially climatic, but those varieties of colour and material, of which, owing to British skill and commerce, Italy has no longer the monopoly. From the later Gothic forms, those called the Perpendicular and the Flamboyant, he would seize upon their special mastery of the principles of continuity and verticality. We need not consider at length Mr. Hope's detailed contrast of the early French and early English Pointed styles, nor even his description of the culminating Middle Period; although his dissertation is a very favourable specimen of architectural argument,—fresh and graphic and original, without over technicality. It has the advantage also of copious pictorial illustration. Let it suffice to note and endorse the conclusion; which is that the English Middle Gothic is better adapted to be the point of departure for our new or improved style than the French variety of Chartres, Auxerre, or Laon.

Having thus established his middle position between the purely archæological school and the forward spirits who aspire to develop what they call a 'Victorian architecture,' Mr. Beresford Hope makes a pardonable digression by way of defending himself from the charge that might be brought against him that he was more narrow and bigoted in his architectural creed than his father Thomas Hope, the author of the well-known 'History of Architecture.' We quite agree that the services of Thomas Hope to the cause of art in England have never been sufficiently recognised. His son very gracefully, and with much feeling, does justice in these respects to his father's memory. He reminds us of what we owe to Thomas Hope, not only for his indirect patronage of art, but for his own experiments, even when they were unsuccessful. It is true that the first idea of art-manufacture, that is 'of allying the beauty of form to the wants and productions of common life,' was first conceived and exemplified by the gifted author of 'Anastasia,' and that he was quizzed for his pains by Sydney Smith in the *Edinburgh Review*. For our parts we are glad to borrow from his son's pages the following eloquent passage—the peroration of the 'History of Architecture'—which admirably embodies the

views now generally held with respect to the proper architecture of our own country and age.

"No one seems yet to have conceived the smallest wish or idea of only borrowing of every former style of architecture whatever it might present of useful or ornamental, of scientific or tasteful; of adding thereto whatever other new dispositions or forms might afford conveniences or elegancies not yet possessed; of making the new discoveries, the new conquests, of natural productions unknown to former ages, the models of new imitations more beautiful and more varied; and thus of composing an architecture which, born in our own country, grown on our soil, and in harmony with our climate, institutions, and habits, at once elegant, appropriate, and original, should truly deserve the appellation of 'Our Own.'"—P. 64.

Having thus settled the general style of architecture in which he thinks that a modern cathedral ought to be built, Mr. Beresford Hope next proceeds to discuss the equally important question of its ground-plan. And here he combats *in limine* the objection that a church of cathedral dimensions is suited only for Roman Catholic worship, while the Anglican ritual and the spirit of the Reformed Church demand merely small and compact buildings. This, in fact, is the old objection of Sir Christopher Wren, who, though he built S. Paul's cathedral, yet expressed an opinion that a church for Anglican worship ought not to exceed the area which an average speaker could fill with his voice. The sufficient answer to this is, of course, that while a church is an *auditorium*, it is also something more and something higher. Mr. Beresford Hope thinks the objection deserving of a formal refutation. Accordingly he proceeds to lay down what are the distinctive purposes of a Roman and English cathedral, as a preliminary step to the argument that the latter has its own necessary *differentia* from a mere parish church. Comparing the ground-plan of S. Paul's Cathedral with that of the new votive Church of the Immaculate Conception, designed by Herr Statz of Köln, for the city of Linz, in Western Austria, he finds that while the features which both have in common are an altar, a stalled choir with bishop's throne, a font and a pulpit, the latter has, in addition, a considerable number of chapels, with subsidiary altars. These minor altars, as they are no longer used in our ancient cathedrals, nor included in the general restorations of those churches, are details which no one would dream of reviving in a modern cathedral. The Duomo of Milan, which (as every one knows) was originally designed for the single altar of the severe Ambrosian rite, is an example of a Pointed cathedral of the first class which would be suitable, without alteration, for our Anglican ritual. This theoretic conclusion has been long exemplified in practice in the churches, used as cathedrals, which have been built of late years in the British Islands or the

Colonies. Few, except those who have examined the matter with special care, are aware how many cathedrals have been founded within the last twenty years by the Anglican communion. Mr. Beresford Hope's running commentary on these churches, ranging from Bishop Daniel Wilson's cathedral at Calcutta, to Mr. Burges' most recent design for Brisbane, is not the least attractive portion of his volume, being illustrated with numerous ground-plans and perspective views or elevations. Mr. Butterfield's cathedral of S. Ninian's at Perth, and Mr. Slater's cathedral of Kilmore, are the first in order which are here considered. Then come the late Mr. Carpenter's projected ground-plan for a cathedral at Inverness, and his design for one at Colombo, neither of which have been carried out, though the former is not yet abandoned in intention. Brisbane cathedral, a conception of remarkable originality and ability, seems to us the most characteristic and satisfactory of all these designs. We should be glad, indeed, to hear that there was any chance of its being executed. A church, by Mr. Slater, for S. Kitt's, scarcely claims admission here, as it seems to us, being neither cathedral in dignity nor remarkably well adapted for the climatic conditions of that island. Nor again do we quite understand why the two prize designs for the memorial church at Constantinople—that of Mr. Burges, which has undergone so many and such cruel retrenchments before its erection can be actually begun, and the exquisitely pure and graceful architectural conception of Mr. Street—are represented by their ground-plans in this category. However, we are very glad to possess them; and, for the same reason, we welcome the ground-plan of Mr. G. G. Scott's Lutheran church of S. Nicholas at Hamburg, though we must say that, on Mr. Beresford Hope's own showing, it is scarcely a case in point. For here the design is plainly intended for three altars, if there is any meaning at all in its apsidal choir flanked by two apsidally-ended aisles. It would perhaps have been fairer to Mr. Scott, had his cathedral of S. John's, New-foundland, been substituted for this fine, but somewhat unreal, Lutheran church. The cathedrals of Fredericton and Montreal are briefly described, and then Mr. Beresford Hope does hearty justice to the motives and munificence of the founder of S. Paul's Cathedral, Calcutta. But the æsthetic delinquencies of this well-meant but most unsuccessful design are almost enough to overweigh our admiration of Bishop Wilson's generosity. Sydney cathedral, and the church now building at Singapore for the Bishop of Labuan (which last is described as a kind of reproduction of Netley Abbey), are the next that are mentioned. Other churches, which serve as cathedrals for the various colonial bishops, have no pretensions to cathedral rank; and,

although some claims are put forward in behalf of Trinity Church, New York, no diocese of the Republican States of North America has as yet advanced to the point of providing a proper church for the reception of the bishop's chair.

Summing up the experience which may be gathered from all these examples, Mr. Hope contends that an architect, intending to design a modern Anglican cathedral, will find that the ruling distinction between a parochial and a cathedral church consists in the different treatment required for the eastern end of the pile. While the parish church requires but a limited sanctuary to hold its modest altar and its one or two officiating priests, the cathedral must have room for a far larger number of ministering clergy, besides accommodation for the bishop, and suitable arrangements for such episcopal functions as ordinations and visitations. We may here quote our author's own language:—

'It is certain that the cathedral would not be perfect without the existence of a body of clergy, both to assist and counsel the Bishop and to serve the Church itself, and of frequent and solemn services at which that caputular body would properly and legitimately officiate. The existence of such a body—the "Chapter" as it is called—involves the construction of a choir of a capacity superior to that of an ordinary parochial church. Then, again, the specific duties which the Bishop himself has to perform, with the assistance of this Chapter—duties, that is, which are the formal cause why there should be an "*ecclesia cathedralis*"—a church with the bishop's chair in it—are all of them of a nature which demand space for their due transaction. Visitations, whether episcopal or archidiaconal, bring together large bodies of the clergy, and their most appropriate place of gathering is the cathedral choir, where, in proportion as they become less of conventional formalities, and more of administrative realities, the necessity for ample sitting-room will be increased. For these objects, at Montreal and Fredericton, as well as elsewhere, special accommodation has been liberally provided with the best effect in the eastern portion of the respective churches. Ordinations, again, are now treated, as they should be, as very solemn realities, which ought not to be performed in a corner. The larger the congregation present is, the more edifying will that rite be; while the common sense of the world has begun to perceive that private chapels are not their most appropriate scene. Upon the additional importance to the rite which its performance in the cathedral itself would give to a town confirmation I need not enlarge; but confirmations emphatically require ample room for their various incidents. These are the absolute legal services and duties of the episcopate, which most pressingly claim the cathedral church as the peculiar home of their celebration, and which necessitate, as the distinguishing feature of that church, an amplitude of space beyond that which is required for the "sittings" or "kneelings" of the average place of worship.'—Pp. 115, 116.

With much adroitness Mr. Hope next presses into his service the recent demands which have been made for special preachings and for large choral gatherings. We do not remember to have seen the observation before, but it is undoubtedly a true one, that the mere fact of the continuous retention of choral service 'through generations of coldness and corruption indicates a current of popularity which must have run very strongly, to

'have run so long.' It is true that the cathedral system need not have been revived at the Restoration. In fact, musicians know better than Mr. Hope, how practically difficult it must have been to set up choral service again, after it had fallen for many years into abeyance, and after all its traditions had been rudely broken. There is no doubt that the musical offices would not have been restored, unless the recollection of them, which so strongly affected even the Puritan Milton, had been very dear to the national mind. With considerable humour Mr. Hope traces, all through the dark Georgian period, the vitality of the choral service of the Church of England, and the subsidiary proofs of the popularity of the use of music in the sanctuary, as proved by the bands and choirs of village galleries, the psalm-singing of the followers of Wesley and Whitfield, the festivals of the cathedral choirs, and the annual muster of the charity children in S. Paul's. The spark which smouldered on in the past age has burst into flame in our own days. The great choral festivals which have been held at Southwell, at Lichfield, and at Ely, when hundreds of village choirs assembled for solemn worship in the mother-church of the diocese, and the naves of those vast buildings were crowded almost to suffocation, have proved incontestably that our largest cathedrals are not too large for solemn diocesan purposes. We make less account for the rage for special preachings. We are not satisfied that there was ever any real demand for these sermons, or that they have done any real good. Besides which, we so far agree with Sir Christopher Wren, in the opinion which we quoted above, that not more than a certain number of persons can ever profitably hear a preacher. Few clergymen are gifted with the lungs of Mr. Spurgeon; and even that orator is said to be now, from prudential motives, more chary of his voice. Still, the argument drawn from the Special Sermons has a certain weight; and whether or no there is much good in assembling more people together to hear a sermon than a preacher can command with his voice, there can be no doubt that the number is all but unlimited that can profitably assist at an act of solemn worship chorally performed by a vast number of singers. The arrangements in the interiors of some of our cathedrals, which have been made for the accommodation of immense congregations, have not been so seemly or judicious as to reconcile us to this particular movement. We prophesy that the day will come, after this particular *furor* has subsided, when the destruction of some of the close screens of our ancient cathedrals will be regretted. Our contemporary, the *Ecclesiologist*, was right, we think, in the distinction which it drew between the ordinary choral services of a cathedral chapter, and the occasional solemn services at

which vast multitudes are assembled. S. Paul's Cathedral, since its alteration, is arranged for the common worship of a mighty crowd, such as may be gathered on a few Sunday evenings during the winter months. How forlorn the interior appears at an ordinary morning service, with a dozen boys, three clergy, and a congregation of two, including the vergers, may be easily imagined. The fact is, that the close choir is very well suited for the ordinary daily services. For special services the nave is available; and ought then, as we believe, to be fitted with a temporary choir and a second altar-table. For even Protestant ritualists, like Mede, have taught us that Christian public worship should always take place in connexion with the Christian 'Mercy-seat.' To some extent, therefore, the arrangements of Westminster Abbey seem to us right in principle. There is, indeed, no altar at the nave services; but a temporary choir is fitted up at the eastern end of the nave, and the proper choir is not yet destroyed. But Durham, Ely, Lichfield, and Chichester have already lost their close screens, to the undoubted injury of the effect of the interior, and to the discomfort of the choir, without any proportional gain. We confess that we should have been glad if Mr. Beresford Hope had expressed himself more decidedly on this important question. We suspect, however, that he has been fascinated by the most exceptional vision of the whole area of a cathedral used for common worship,—a long choir full of surpliced singers, and an enormous nave crowded with kneeling worshippers. But who expects that this will ever be witnessed, except for a time on some Sunday evenings, when there is the attraction rather of some popular preacher than of the highest act of Christian worship? We doubt if the game is worth the candle. We have no great confidence, we must own, in the vitality of such volunteer organizations as those upon which Mr. Beresford Hope seems to depend for filling the stalls and *subsellæ* of an ideal cathedral with unpaid singers. Nothing, indeed, can be more true and more humorous than his description of the way in which the *mauvaise honte* of a typical Englishman has yielded, and is yielding, to the official garb of a surplice in choir, or of a volunteer uniform on parade. We have no doubt that an energetic parish priest, or even the precentor of a cathedral, may maintain a voluntary choir for a considerable period, especially when anything like an *esprit du corps* can be originated. But this is a very different thing from reckoning upon such an institution for the permanent supply of the deficiencies of the reduced *personnels* of our reformed and impoverished cathedrals. However, we may say, with all sincerity, that we trust Mr. Beresford Hope is more right in his anticipations than we are ourselves.

Another difficulty now looms in the way of the prospective cathedral-builder. He is supposed to have settled his architectural style, the general requirements of his ground-plan, the dimensions of his building, and the proportional relation of his nave, choir, and sanctuary. But on what precise principle is he to arrange the last member of his design? Is he to adopt the typical form of mediæval Gothic—the long-drawn choir, with the sanctuary and its altar at the eastern extremity?—or the Basilican form of church, with its altar midway between the clergy and the people? Are the clergy and singers to intervene between the altar and the laity, or is the altar to divide the people and choristers in the nave from the bishop and his attendant clergy in the synthronus of the eastern apse? This is the question which next engages our author's attention. After describing the two principles of church arrangement in language borrowed from his father's treatise, and after protesting that the discussion is neither strictly architectural nor polemical, he argues against the Basilican form of church upon social grounds solely, and as a question of policy and expediency. His position is, that to revert to a Basilican arrangement would be 'a false anti-quarianism, a forced and exaggerated return to a state of feeling, civilization, and laws, which never can recur.' It would be an attempt at reviving the Roman social fabric of the age of Constantine and Theodosius. On the other hand, a wise spirit of 'moderate and retrospective progressionism,' answering to what is called 'liberal conservatism' in politics, would lead us, in our author's opinion, to retain 'the reformatory modification of the mediæval cathedral.' This would be, as he expresses it,

'The correlative of the historical progress of the English people, who now, in the days of Victoria, as once in the days of Edward III., possess their House of Lords and House of Commons, their courts of common law and equity, and their episcopal church—the same in their basis, yet altered, developed, improved, and reformed by the progressive wisdom of centuries.'—P. 143.

The discussion of this subject, in Mr. Beresford Hope's hands, is most interesting as well as instructive. His point is, that the congregational worship of the primitive Church was 'corporate.' The Church met not merely for common acts of worship, but as an organized assembly, 'ecclesia;' in which every part of the body corporate was officially represented, each in its proper place in the appointed 'hall of assembly.' Although we think this idea rather over-subtle, we shall do most justice to our author by allowing him to expound it in its fulness in the following eloquent passage:—

'The early Christian Church was unquestionably "*Civitas Dei*" to a greater extent than the Church has ever since been able to become. This distinctive-

ness of corporate character arose not only from its own unity and purity, but from the depth of civilized corruption in the Pagan world around. North and south, east and west, reigned the same fearful, inevitable, "Res Romana," an empire of ungodliness, which seemed almost conterminous with the wide world itself. Isolated accordingly from all the gravest habits of thought, no less than the popular amusements, of the empire—within, though hardly of, which the early Christians were—they were thrown back upon the organization of their own interior commonwealth, with a depth of veneration and a passionateness of devotion of which the denizens of a Christianised world can hardly form a conception. This *Res Romana* was absolutely alien to them in its nobler aspirations, no less than in the depths of its unutterable corruption. Its corruption was a foul and confused mass of abnormal sensuality, cruelty, puerile superstition, and atheism. But even in its better aspect it was an organized rebellion against an external and independent revelation, in the form of a national religion where the state claimed not only to define the forms but to create the gods. It was an act of citizenship, and not of faith, to invoke—

Di patrii, Indigetes et Romule, Vestaque mater
Quæ Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia servas;

and the conquering Augustus went to war—

Cum patribus, populoque, Penatibus, et magnis Dis;

and so the genius of each living Augustus, and the divinity of such of his predecessors as were not obnoxious to the actual representatives of the Cæsarism, became in time the official recipients of the political worship. Against this wickedness it was the mission of the early Christians to protest with their life-blood. Their Lord of Lords and King of Kings was the Eternal Trinity, worshipped through the Incarnate Son; and in proportion as the Roman state was leagued to uphold its adulterate cultus, so the Christian commonwealth was banded round the universal Cross. Suddenly freed from the impending dread of martyrdom, and enfolded with spacious places of worship, and the means of building others, by Constantine, the long-persecuted Christians most naturally carried the expression of their whole system, administrative and hierarchical, as well as ritual, into the distribution of their basilicæ. The basilica was the church, the court of justice, the chapter-house, and the comitia of the sacred republic. Nay, it was the place of punishment also, for the open shame to which the excommunicate and the "flentes" were for long years put in the eyes of their fellow-Christians, was no small element of primitive discipline. Accordingly the semicircular tribunal of justice became, without a change, the seat of the bishop and his attendant clergy—for synodical deliberation no less than for common worship. They sat there, not merely as ecclesiastics who were either conducting the service or showing forth the example of their own devotions to the people, but as the rulers of the congregated fold upon the seat of majesty. Very soon, or rather simultaneously, another sense, not founded on its material introduction into the Christian economy, but deeply and logically significative, was attached to the semicircular array of clergy. It was no longer the mere transmuted tribunal of the civil judges of the Roman Commonwealth, but the emblem of the Apocalyptic session of the Elders round the Divine Throne. The art of the mosaicist was called in to heighten the significance of this idea, and the conch of the apse displayed the gigantic and awful effigy of the Saviour in judgment, either alone, or in company with angels, apostles, or saints. Sometimes other representations were shown, but the lesson taught was always of the same character; while the arch between the nave and the transepts received the name of the Triumphal Arch, and the broad wall-space over its span was also storied with sacred imagery.

'In the reassignment of the basilica to the needs of Christian worship, there might have been a difficulty in the selection of the place to be occupied by the holiest spot of all—the altar. But the conjoint fact of the magisterial session of the clergy in the bema, and of the symbolical signification assigned to that session, at once raised and solved the difficulty. The Apocalypse not only revealed "God who sitteth upon the throne," but also the Lamb who was slain. Our Lord appears there alike as King and Priest, and as the Victim also, and the basilica had to show Him forth in both characters. The bishop throned at the extremity of the apse furnished one manifestation, the other was sought in the altar and its sacrament. The position for the altar which we should think most natural—the extreme end of the choir—would not have corresponded with the entire conception, for it would have displaced the throne, so the altar was placed forward and detached, between the tribunal and the people, while the officiating priest took his place on its far side (as viewed from the nave), looking over it and towards the general congregation.'—Pp. 152—155.

Mr. Beresford Hope's theory seems to be, that the solemn session of the clergy in the synthronus was designed to symbolize the supremacy of the spirituality in the representative Church, and that accordingly, when the days of persecution were over, and the world had become Christian, the arrangement, having lost its significance, fell gradually into disuse. The embodied *Civitas Dei* could not exist in its ideal and organic purity when the state was no longer heathen and when 'Caesar's seat had to be 'provided together with the bishop's throne in the Christian 'temple.' It was, he thinks, by an instinctive feeling that the architects of Constantinople, from the beginning, substituted for the old Basilican type another form of church which represented rather the common acts of Christian worship than the solemn representative assembly of the body spiritual. It is more easy to doubt the truth of this ingenious theory than to disprove it. Mr. Beresford Hope has perhaps hit upon the right scent as to the use of the bema and synthronus when, upon the evidence of Torcello and San Ambrogio at Milan, he points out that the bishop and his presbyters met in synod in the former, and the archbishop and his suffragans in council in the latter. This is not improbable, and in this suggestion we may have a clue to one of the most puzzling difficulties of ecclesiological antiquity. Who has not wondered how the bema was used in all the contemporary basilicas of Rome or Ravenna? It is not to be supposed that each such basilica had a bishop; nor that each titular church in Rome had a body of clergy large enough to fill its bema. What then if the bema were the *Capitulum*, so to call it, of each church? In an ordinary church the priest with his assistants, in a cathedral church the bishop with his clergy, might here meet in solemn conclave. Meetings of ecclesiastics which are now held in vestry rooms might assuredly be more fitly convened in the bema of a basilica, in presence of the altar. The formal

arrangements of a Council of the Church, it may be observed, do in some way recall the plan of the bema. No distribution of seats could be more appropriate for a conclave. No one can have attended an election for proctors held, as it sometimes is, in the choir of a church, without feeling how singularly inappropriate the arrangements are for purposes of debate. On the other hand a tribune would be singularly convenient for such a use. A *rudidecanal* chapter now-a-days is driven to the vestry or the parson's library, because the chancel of the church is so obviously unfit for the meeting from the position of the seats. This hypothesis also explains the coexistence of the bema and of the *chorus cantorum* in San Clemente of Rome; and it is easy to see why the arrangement, however convenient, would gradually fall into disuse, especially when the growth of the monastic system made it necessary to have a *capitulum* of larger dimensions and also fitted for other, such as disciplinary, uses. And curiously enough, the upper church at Assisi, used for the most solemn meetings of the Franciscan order, is arranged in fact after the model of a tribune. There seem to us many reasons for supposing that the *synthronus* was not solely meant for the seat of the bishop and his attendants at public worship, but for occasional use in some or all of the ways which we have specified. We shall be glad to invite the attention of ritualists to this curious question.

Pursuing his idea that the *synthronus* was chiefly, if not exclusively, used for the formal seating of the clergy at the public celebration of the Eucharistic service, Mr. Beresford Hope finds, in the examples of this arrangement at Torcello and San Clemente, two merely antiquarian retentions of already disused practices. He would, perhaps, have modified this view had he remembered how numerous the Basilican churches are at Rome and Ravenna, not to speak of the many others scattered about Italy and the eastern coast of the Adriatic. It surprises us to find him drawing so wide a distinction as he does between the Eucharistic service and the other rites and offices of the Church. Again, is there any authority for the supposition that the individual Christian began, in the very earliest times, to regard the shrine of the martyr as an object of deeper interest and affection than the altar itself? We cannot but question the idea involved in the following sentence. 'At once the personal feeling was created, and every worshipper was led to church to deal for his own soul's health with the varying sacred accidents of every sanctuary.' This tendency, in Mr. Beresford Hope's opinion, led to the use of the subsidiary altars in the added chapels in preference to the single common altar of the primitive basilica. And next, the fact that religion was spread in Northern Europe by the monastic

bodies, who, instead of using the vernacular dialects, maintained the old Latin forms of prayer, led to the exclusion of the laity from the regular services of the Church. These services were said in choir, which part of the sacred building became accordingly the most important part of the church: while the common worship, shared by the laity with the clergy, which was practicable when Latin was the common language of all, became no longer possible. Admitting this hypothesis as a sufficient explanation of the peculiar mediæval type of church which was gradually developed north of the Alps, we may well be curious to see how the almost necessary inference is avoided that now, since a vernacular service has been restored, we should do well to revert to that Basilican arrangement which was found so convenient in the primitive age, and which was chiefly superseded, because the laity could no longer take a part in the religious offices of the ecclesiastics. The change itself is excellently described in these sentences:—

‘Rome, upon its inflexible principle of finding a reason and providing a system for every turn of time and tide, has long been ready with *à priori* arguments to show that Latin is the sacred language of the West; but the fact stands patent, in all history, that the lapse from vernacular to dead-tongue services was gradual and imperceptible. As the people’s services at the basilica, in the language of their nursery and their domestic hearth, became the monks’ services in the monastic church, in the language of the Vulgate and the cloister, and of the men who lived very far away, and very long ago; so the arrangement of parts, the inward organization of the services themselves, underwent a perceptible change.’—P. 167.

We wish, too, that we could quote the words in which the gradual perfection of the typical mediæval church is traced from the original basilica to such an abbey-church as that of Cluny, with its altar far removed from the nave, and the long choir shut off from the laity by its high and close screen returned—as it is technically termed—at the west end. Here comes in the turning point of our author’s theory. His ideal cathedral is a compromise between these two ideas. To revert to the Basilica would be, he thinks, an extreme and unjustifiable reaction. The wiser and more cautious policy is to adopt and develop the principles upon which our mediæval forefathers, in order to meet the new wants of their times, modified the ‘exclusive abbey-church’ into the ‘more open cathedral.’ The accomplished French architectural writer, M. Viollet le Duc, has pursued a parallel line of thought in his ‘*Dictionnaire Raisoné de l’Architecture Française*,’ in which he connects this change with the increase of municipal freedom in the great towns. As the present writer forcibly enough expresses it, he conceives of the mediæval cathedral as ‘a minster popularized,’ whereas our author’s view regards it as ‘a basilica minsterized.’ Whatever be the value

of this distinction, Mr. Beresford Hope goes on to observe with approbation that the mediæval bishop, satisfied with his throne in choir and his chair on the north side of the sanctuary for 'pontifical mass,' had the 'commendable tact not to arrogate 'to himself the tremendous character which his more unworldly predecessor of early days assumed when he sat in the apse beneath the sitting Saviour in the mosaic vault above.' We must confess that we doubt this hypothesis. The ancient patriarchal chair preserved at Canterbury is alone enough to prove that there was no hesitation in assuming the ancient position of the Episcopal throne, where it was possible from the architectural arrangements of the building. If, as we have surmised, this seat was not so much the place whence the bishop took part in the regular offices of worship, as his official *cathedra* or seat of honour, in which he would be enthroned, and from which he would preside on synodical occasions, it is less remarkable that it should not be of universal occurrence in mediæval cathedrals, especially those of less than metropolitical dignity, when it is remembered that every such church had a distinct chapter-house attached to it, which would be a far more convenient theatre for such functions as we have mentioned. We must admit that Mr. Beresford Hope has a rather apposite example of a strained revival of Basilicanism in the pedantic arrangement of the restored Romanesque cathedral of Spires. He complains that the bishop's throne in the apse is far away, 'out of sight and out of sound.' The question, however; we repeat, is whether this throne was ever intended for the bishop's seat during Divine service; and we doubt whether the same criticism might not be passed on the apsidal chair in some of the larger Roman basilicas themselves. Still we are quite ready to agree with Mr. Hope, that, whatever may be the theoretical advantages of the pure Basilican plan, it is at once necessary and expedient in practice for us to be satisfied with our national tradition of church arrangement, and to endeavour to develop and improve it, not to subvert it. It is quite true, as he well observes, that this policy is in harmony with English habits and precedents. We followed this rule in reforming our public offices of worship, and the Church of England has embodied, in a distinct rubric, its will that 'the chancels shall remain as in times past.' No other course was possible in restoring an existing cathedral, than to preserve substantially the relative mediæval positions of the choir and the sanctuary. Mr. Beresford Hope would argue that the substitution of an open for a close screen is not so much a destructive process as a wholesome reform, whereby the proper purpose of the choir is better fulfilled. He is able to add with perfect truth that the founders of new cathedrals among us have

instinctively followed the principles which guided our forefathers. We have no wish in practice to countenance any other system of church arrangement, even though we have freely pointed out a few weak points, as we think them, in Mr. Beresford Hope's argument. The difficulties of reviving the Basilican arrangements in the England of the nineteenth century would be neither small nor few; though we are not sure that we quite agree with Mr. Beresford Hope as to their kind or degree. His safest ground for the conclusion at which he has arrived is that no one really wishes any change. Had we to choose afresh between the two systems on their respective merits, we should probably find it as hard to defend the one as to recommend the other. We will allow the essayist to sum up his conclusion in his own words:—

'Into the great risk of the change being, from its entire novelty, as unpopular as it would be perplexing, I need not enter. My readers can supply this point for themselves. In any aspect it would, I am convinced, be very inexpedient, when we possess a natural and national tradition of church arrangement, suited to and used in our cathedrals, both old and new, which is every day being better understood, and therefore more popular. In this usage, as we have seen, the bishops and the cathedral clergy modestly abstain from assuming the seats of magisterial dignity, which their predecessors in the primitive ages did not fear to occupy. The bishop, indeed, with us has his throne, but that throne is at the side, where he sits *primus inter pares*; and the only distinction between the clergy and the choirmen and choristers is that of an upper stall. So, too, in the body of the church, the marked distinctions and corporate enrolment of early discipline are wanting; and yet the whole pile is open to the joint worship of those who choose to come, while those who are absent keep aloof on their own responsibility.

'Let it be proved that this system is less real and less appropriate to our present condition of society than that of the basilica, and I shall then recall my opinion.'—Pp. 188, 189.

From this point the artistic interest of Mr. Beresford Hope's dissertation rather wanes. Leaving the general characteristics of his ideal modern cathedral, he now addresses himself to matters of detail. The minimum area of a cathedral nave, the propriety of a cruciform plan, with the expediency of curtailing the transepts, and the treatment of the central 'crossing' or lantern, are the first points which engage his attention. His hints that the neo-Gothic style may possibly develop the octagonal lantern of Ely, Antwerp, and Milan into something finer than Brunelleschi's dome at Florence, or Wren's cupola at St. Paul's, open a most interesting subject of speculation, upon which we must say a few words. His own suggestions point to a polygonal dome with an oval section as the most likely form which such a lantern would assume. He might have strengthened his argument by referring to the distinctly Pointed character of the sections of most of the famous domes in the

Mahometan architecture of the East. The plea for a circular or polygonal nave is less likely to meet support among English ecclesiologists. It is true that this form of building, 'cradled at Jerusalem,' as Mr. Beresford Hope expresses it, 'round the holiest of all shrines,' was adopted of old, not only for baptisteries, but for the naves of churches, as San Vitale of Ravenna, the Dom at Aachen, S. Gereon at Köln, and our Round Churches in England. But none of these examples are very promising. The buildings in question are indeed of unique interest, but they are far from convenient. The ground-plans of the churches of Aachen and S. Gereon, which Mr. Bersford Hope lays before us, are worth considering in this light, as a mere matter of church arrangement. Our author, mindful of the conservative policy which had led him to withstand the revival of Basilican arrangements, guards himself against the retort that a circular nave would be a still greater innovation, by the reply that he does not propose to invert the organic parts of his church, but merely to alter the shape of one part. Accordingly he assumes that his circular nave will have a spacious choir attached to it; and he himself observes that the junction of the two is the real practical difficulty in the way of his suggestion. To us, however, he seems to overlook the far more grave difficulty which underlies the use of a circular structure. The proper function of a domical building seems to be to inclose some object of reverence which occupies its centre. For our Lord's tomb it was instinctively felt that a domed circle would form the most appropriate shrine. So again for a baptistery—over and above the symbolical reasons which Mr. Beresford Hope elsewhere mentions—the circular, or octagonal, or polygonal form is by far the most convenient shape—the actual font occupying the exact centre of the building. In like manner it is the 'confessio' of S. Peter which gives its full significance to the dome of the Vatican; and the shrine-like tomb prepared for the first Napoleon, though itself an after-thought, was felt to give a reason, so to say, for the cupola of the Invalides. In like manner it may be remarked that the position of the grave of Nelson in S. Paul's, 'just under the very centre of the dome,' is repeatedly referred to, by a sort of instinct, as though it gave the required key to the use and purpose of the vast cupola above it. The truth is that a circular church, if used for the general purposes of a church and not merely as a shrine or a baptistery, seems to require that its altar should occupy the centre. This it is which makes the dome of Florence so deeply impressive; and the same may be said of the otherwise cold and unpleasing domical interior of the neighbouring San Lorenzo. It has often been urged that the proper arrangement of S. Paul's Cathedral would require

the altar, under a baldachin, to be brought down under the dome. Without expressing a decided opinion upon this suggestion, we may at least observe that the effect of the way in which this vast area has been made available for the special services is about as unsatisfactory as can be conceived. The innovation of a central altar is so hyper-Basilican and revolutionary that we do not much wonder at Mr. Beresford Hope's significant silence on the subject.

There will be little or no difference of opinion as to most of the other details which are next discussed in succession. The great importance of breadth, and of well-devised interior levels, is admitted on all hands. Mr. Beresford Hope argues against the central position of the organ and against recessing the stalls between the piers of the choir-arcades, as has been done at Wells and at Durham. The matter of fixed seats *versus* movable chairs is left by him as an open question. Touching the east end, he advocates warmly the employment of the apse and surrounding aisle—the *chevet* of French Gothic—where space and funds permit. He speaks with all the weight of experience and practical knowledge when he advises that the altar should be brought forward from the east walls even in a square-ended choir, and that in apsidal east ends it should stand on the chord of the arc. Commending the reredos-treatment of the restored choirs of Ely and Lichfield, he laments—and he claims the support of the late Sir Charles Barry in this judgment—the present undignified position of the altar at the extreme east end of the choir-apse of S. Paul's.

In connexion with the triple division of the interior height of a church between arcade, triforium, and clerestory, Mr. Beresford Hope discusses episodically a very curious point of church arrangement, viz. the use of a triforial gallery. Abandoning early precedents, or those of Byzantine origin, he finds such galleries in San Ambrogio, at Milan; San Michele, at Pavia; and, north of the Alps, in S. Castor of Coblenz; and in most of the later churches of the Romanesque of the Rhine. Dr. Whewell, as is well known, considers that such triforial galleries were used for the accommodation of some classes of the congregation. Mr. Hope seems to think that, although they may have been often put to a practical use, they are due to nothing else than a constructional convenience, which was followed out with 'that superb disregard of space which characterises so many other features of mediæval church-building.' He does not enter upon the equally curious question as to the purpose of the narthex-galleries which are so often found in Germany, and which seem, on the authority of Mr. Neale's recent '*Æcclesiological Notes in Dalmatia, &c.*,' to extend

far down the valley of the Danube. Practically, Mr. Beresford Hope advises, that if galleries are needed in modern churches, they should form part of the original construction, on the type of the enlarged triforia of the Romanesque and earlier Pointed styles. From the triforium our author mounts to the clerestory and the roof. We need not say that he lays it down as an axiom that a cathedral church should have a vaulted roof. But he does not absolutely forbid a wooden groining, and he is tempted beyond his self-imposed limits to speculate on the possibility of roofing a vast area, lightly and inexpensively, with a metal framework, filled in with slabs of porcelain or terra-cotta. In his further remarks about steeples, porches, and the western *façade*, there is nothing to call for observation. He concludes the purely architectural part of the work with some excellent advice as to the use of colour in internal decoration, and a *résumé* of the rapid progress of architectural art in England. He looks to the facilities of constructive coloration which modern science and means of transport have given us, as likely to afford us some compensation for the greater simplicity of plan which the ritual of the Church of England imposes upon our new churches and cathedrals. We must here allow ourselves one more quotation.

‘Above all, the unity of all art is beginning to be practically recognised. The architect, the painter, and the sculptor no longer selfishly pursue their own independent profession, as if they were rivals and antagonists, but they either of themselves borrow, from time to time, their neighbour’s craft, or else they combine together—while each adheres to his own department—to complete those works whose failure or whose success depends upon the combination. Giotto, it is at last recollected, both painted and built; and Michael Angelo was sculptor, painter, and architect.

‘In one word, ecclesiastical, and, indeed, all architecture in England, is at this moment working out for itself that lesson which the equalising effects of science now enable northern regions to learn to an extent which used to be only allowed to the warmer south—that of the fusion of construction and decoration in the variety of materials, natural and artificial, and the contrast of their forms and colours. It is the experimental adoption of this system which makes the broad distinction between the more meritorious new churches of the ten last years and their predecessors built within the ten preceding years. Accordingly I anticipate that our new cathedral will show still more complete and gorgeous developments of English polychromatic architecture than we have yet beheld. I go further, and I say that it is to the successful working out of this element of beauty that I look in the new cathedral as the compensating æsthetic advantage for the disuse of those constructional features—those double aisles and fringing chapels—of the old cathedral which, with all their grandeur and their loveliness, can find no place in our purer and simpler system.’—Pp. 251, 252.

Those who have followed us so far will not need to be reminded that a more exhaustive or practical architectural

treatise than the present has seldom issued from the press. No one can speak with more authority on such subjects than our present author, who is known not only as a zealous student of architectural art, but as an actual church-builder on the largest and most sumptuous scale. He has produced a volume which cannot fail to become the manual of those who will be called upon in future years to found or to design cathedrals. Let us hope that he may have the satisfaction of seeing his advice followed in the construction of many a sacred fane. This will not be the least of the author's services to the Church of England.

NOTICES.

WE have received intimations from various quarters of the interest excited by the account given in this Review, just a twelvemonth since, of the writings of Prince Albert de Broglie. We may therefore feel sure that many of our readers, who have formed some idea of his powers of treating the *past*, as exhibited in the 'L'Église et l'Empire Romain,' will not be sorry to see a notice of two volumes of reprints from the same pen, entitled 'Questions de Religion et d'Histoire' (Paris: Levy), which, for the most part, bear more upon the *present*. We have not yet had time to examine all the separate essays as they deserve, but we may venture to characterise a few of the principal ones. One on the civilization of the sixteenth century contains something like an apology for that Renaissance movement, which has been so fiercely attacked, not only by Englishmen (such as Palgrave, Robert Browning, and Ruskin), but even still more severely, if possible, by the ultramontane school in France. M. de Broglie's view of the case is original and interesting. He is justly severe upon M. Michelet's history of that epoch. Besides a very pleasing sketch of the late great pulpit orator, M. de Ravignan, we have a critique on the state of public opinion respecting the great French Revolution, and another of Armand Carrel, which are weighty political studies. In the second volume we find, *inter alia*, a spirited defence of the author's 'L'Église et l'Empire' against the extremely unfair and uncharitable attacks of Dom. Gueranger; and some remarks upon the temporalities of the Papacy, which do not seem to us *quite* free from the besetting fault of French writers on this theme; namely, a disposition to think too little about the happiness of the Italians, and too exclusively about *la gloire de la France*. We suppose, however, that the author will hardly be summoned for this paper before a legal tribunal, as his father, the Duc de Broglie, has just been for his lithographed and private pamphlet. But in the estimation of Anglican theologians, the palm of excellence among these essays will probably be assigned to the masterly and admirable reply of M. de Broglie to the 'Religion Naturelle' of M. Jules Simon. We really do not know where to look for a weightier demonstration of the insufficiency of mere Theism for man's spiritual needs, even when that Theism is combined with such moral purity and warmth of philanthropy as that of M. Simon.

We are enabled to speak in the highest terms of commendation of Mr. Stobart's 'Daily Services for Christian Households.' Our own experience has proved to us that it is well adapted for the purpose for which it was published, and which its title designates. The 'Services' for each day are neither too long nor too short. They are not sermons disguised as prayers, nor are they too much broken up into versicles and responses.

They consist of Confession, Supplication, Praise, Intercession, a Psalm, a Lesson, and a Hymn. Special Collects are added in the Appendix.

The Rev. A. J. D. D'Orsey has delivered a Lecture at the Royal Institution 'On the Study of the English Language,' and has printed his lecture in an extended form (Deighton). His object is to put in a plea for the study of English as an essential part of a University course. He is wise enough not to run a tilt against Classics and Mathematics, but to propose that they should be supplemented by a course of English. We have some fear lest poor Classics and Mathematics should be so 'supplemented' by 'English,' 'Law,' 'Modern History,' 'Natural Science,' and all the *ologies*, as to be swallowed up amongst them, otherwise we have nothing to object to in Mr. D'Orsey's proposal. It is quite certain that a much more extended knowledge of the English language and of English literature than that which they possess, would be of the utmost advantage to most men who leave the University. The time between the B.A. degree and Ordination is, in fact, generally directed to an unsystematic study of English authors. But it is more for the language than for its literature that Mr. D'Orsey pleads. Being a Cambridge man himself, he does not make quite sufficient allowance for what is already done for English composition at Oxford. The weekly essay given at the better colleges, the English essay in the final classical examination, the ethical and historical answers to be written in English, as well as translations to and from the ancient languages and English, must give the better class of students a very considerable familiarity with their mother tongue, even without taking into consideration the studies necessitated by the Law and Modern History school. Still there is room for improvement, if it can be made without displacing the essential studies of the place; and an English Lectureship, such as that held by Mr. D'Orsey himself at Cambridge, is, we think, likely to be productive of some good. The Lecture is written with ability, and the notes and appendices show that the lecturer bestowed infinite pains in working up his subject by reference to numberless authorities. There is one point on which we must beg to differ from him. His suggestion of allowing schoolmasters to look forward to Government Inspectorships, in order to encourage education, reminds us of the proposal that 'the Church' should be 'thrown open' to parish clerks. The parish clerk would be as competent to do the work of the clergyman as the schoolmaster that of the inspector. The glossographical maps and tables accompanying the Lecture are valuable.

We have received the second fascicle of Mr. George Forbes's edition of S. Gregory Nyssen, a work which quite recalls the days of the Mabillons, and Le Quiens, and Holsteins. We hope to notice it at length in our next number; in the meantime, we can only say that the English Church may well be proud of one of her sons who can bring out such an edition of a most difficult author, as we are certain no other living scholar in Europe is capable of producing. In all respects we recommend this edition to our readers, as a work of most uncommon learning, and as a work—for it proceeds from the Pittsigo Press—of hardly less uncommon accuracy.

'The Church in the Public School' (Oxford: J. H. Parker), is the title of a sermon by the Rev. James Skinner. It is not only valuable in itself, as setting forth the respected author's thoughtful views of the real dangers that beset our youth, but is likewise interesting as urging the claims of S. Mary's College, at Harlow, and making more widely known the merits of that institution, and the remarkable manner in which it appears to have been blessed.

We have been disappointed in not being able to lay before our readers a review of Mr. Bright's 'History of the Church, from A.D. 313 to 451' (Oxford and London: J. H. Parker). For the present, therefore, we must be content to express our conviction of the great importance of this addition to our theological literature. At a time when so much of second-rate and second-hand learning is being foisted into our theology, it is truly refreshing to meet with a volume evincing such sound trustworthy research into the *original* authorities for the annals of the time of which it treats. We can confidently speak, from our own investigations, of the scrupulous accuracy of Mr. Bright's work. Few books contain so much compressed information; and though we at times half-regret that the limits of the volume have not allowed space for the display of more of the individual characters and of the indirect action of the Church upon heathenism, it may be safely asserted that there is no prominent saint, doctor, or heresiarch of the time, of whom the reader will not obtain from this small volume a correct and vivid idea, as well as of the general government and fortunes of the Church.

From the Liturgical Revision Society, or from a Liturgical Revision Society, we have received one or two pamphlets. We mention the matter chiefly to show that the snake was not scotched by the protest of the 10,000 clergy. It appears that there is an Irish Revision Society as well as that which publishes curious pamphlets under the title of 'Ingoldsby.' The Irish revisionists have, we find, invited corrections of the Prayer Book, by circulating manuscript forms of fault-finding. The result is before us in a pamphlet, 'Amendments in the Book of Common Prayer, prepared by the Committee of the Liturgical Amendment Society (Ireland),' (Hamilton, Adams & Co.) We extract an amendment or two to show the sort of temper of mind in which revisionists approach holy things. 'The final α to be added to Jesu wherever it is omitted.' 'In the Second Collect after the Commandments, for "kings" substitute "sovereigns,"' 'In the "Exhortation" commencing "Dearly beloved, on Sunday next," &c. for "I purpose," insert "It is purposed;" and omit the word "other" before "discreet."' Let us hazard a revision, and suggest in the case of the clerical revisionists the omission of the word 'discreet' in connexion with themselves. We must, however, place on record that, in a pamphlet entitled 'The further Revision of the Liturgy with reference to "Essays and Reviews," &c.' (Hamilton & Co.), the Bishop of Gloucester, now of Durham, the new Bishop of Durham, to some extent the Primate of Ireland, and Lord Lyttelton, are claimed as more or less favouring revision, and as many as forty-eight pamphlets during the last year only, have been

published on this subject. As in the kindred case of the attempted change in the marriage laws, we are never safe while money, agitation and organization can be commanded.

Mr. W. B. Flower has translated certain of the well-known 'Sermons of S. Bernard on the Church Seasons' (Masters). The volume is a creditable one to Mr. Flower's taste and scholarship, and a 'discreet and learned' sermon writer might take hints from the warm, glowing language of S. Bernard. We deprecate, what, however, is a mistake not very likely to be committed, anything like a wholesale conversion into our pulpits of what is in form and language often unsuitable to these times.

'Egyptian Sepulchres and Egyptian Shrines,' by Miss Emily Beaufort (Longman), is an unexpected treat. We must own to something like an ungallant prejudice against lady travellers, after certain publications of certain ladies who have galloped over Europe and scampered through all sorts of out-of-the-way places in masculine costume, and have described their wanderings in characteristic language. But Miss Beaufort is a traveller of a very different cast. She writes with equal modesty and information. She is really an accomplished antiquarian; and we know no book more useful for the ground over which it goes than these two volumes, not the least or last merit of which consists in some pretty illustrations.

Anything which comes from Dr. M'Caul, especially on subjects involving Hebrew learning, demands respectful attention. His 'Some Notes on the First Chapter of Genesis' (Wertheim), contain criticism and literature which no student ought to pass by. We do not say that on all points Dr. M'Caul is conclusive. But all that he says is important.

'Recent Recollections of the Anglo-American Church in the United States,' by A Layman (Rivingtons), exhibits a very fair and full account of existing facts. It will furnish the materials of a history which is yet to be written. We cannot say that these two volumes are systematic or well put together; but they abound in facts. Apparently the writer or compiler has had a good deal of acquaintance both with living men and the private particulars of current events. His book reads rather like extracts from newspapers; and there is a spice of personal resentment here and there which detracts from its permanent value; though perhaps 'the Layman' does not claim the judicial impartiality of the historian. We may remark, that his sympathies are Northern enough to satisfy Mrs. Beecher Stowe.

The *esquisse*—to use a French term for which we have scarcely an equivalent—on 'Irish History and the Irish Character,' by Professor Goldwin Smith (J. H. and Jas. Parker), is not less remarkable as a fair example of what liberalism in its best form is, than as a specimen of English composition. Very possibly it will offend extreme partisans on either side: but of this the accomplished author is careless. His *thesis* is, that in the melancholy history of Ireland faults on both sides exaggerated and stimulated each other, and that in judging of political crimes we

should make allowances for misfortunes arising from circumstances over which rulers and subjects have no control. He finds the history of Ireland modified by religion, law, climate, and the accidents of civilization; and he brings out the fact, too often lost sight of, that misfortunes have as much to do with history as circumstances. This sketch deserves very careful study.

It is instructive as well as interesting to be reminded from time to time what was the theology of our fathers and grandfathers. The Oxford movement is regarded by so many persons as the origin and starting point of orthodox theology in the present century, that it is useful to be taught that the same sound Church of England doctrine which we have seen revived and slandered was held by a Dr. Routh, a Joshua Watson, and many another clergyman and layman, as the undoubted traditional belief of the Church of England. The Rev. Richard Lyne was a man of great simplicity of character, of deep theological study, and of very considerable general learning. He shut himself up in his little parish of S. Petroc Minor, in Cornwall, and spent the time which was not given to his flock in pious meditation and study. We believe that some very valuable meditative works, which he has left behind him, will be published. We shall hail them with pleasure. The little volume which his daughter now puts forth consists of 'Two Letters' (Wertheim and Macintosh), the first on the authority of the Old Testament, called by him 'Vindiciæ Veteris Testamenti,' the second, on the 'Eternity of Future Punishment.' Of course, the circumstances of the day have made his daughter select these letters for present publication. The following sentence is a characteristic example of the homely and straightforward way in which orthodox Churchmen wrote at the end of the last century:—'The first Christian dissenter was Simon Magus, a man of extraordinary abilities' (p. 60). It is quite true, but no one could express himself in such terms now. We shall be glad to make further acquaintance with Mr. Lyne.

INDEX TO VOL. XLII.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Associated Religious Efforts [*Kaiserwerth Deaconesses*, &c.], 200—223

B.

British Confession, Churches of the [*Morgan, Wright*, &c.], 441—465.
Burke and Washington [*Macknight's Life of Burke, Custis' Recollections of Washington*], 297—318.

C.

Captivity, Princes of the [see *West*].
Cathedral, Modern English [*Beresford Hope on the*, &c.], 466—495.
Clergy Discipline [*Statutes*, &c.], 251—276.
Climbers [see *Mountains*].

D.

Desgenettes, the Abbé [*Œuvres de l'Abbé*, &c.], 113—148.
Discipline [see *Clergy*].

E.

Eastern Church [*Stanley's Lectures*, &c.], 224—256.
Early English Church [*Hook's Lives of the Archbishops*, &c.], 73—108.

F.

Froude's History of England [*From Fall of Wolsey to Death of Elizabeth*], 1—22.

J.

James, John Angell [*Life and Letters of*, &c.], 319—345.

NO. CXV.—N.S.

H.

Henry VIII. [*Thomas Pilgrim*], 346—360.
Hook, Dean [see *Early English Church*].
Hope, Beresford [see *Cathedral*].

M.

Mountains and Climbers [*Publications of Alpine Club*, &c.], 361—380.

O.

Owen on Dogmatic Theology [*Introduction to the Study of*, &c.], 179—199.

P.

Patriarchs of the West [see *West*].
Powell's Essay [*On the Evidences of Christianity*], 149—178.

R.

Religious Efforts [see *Associated*].

S.

Sephardim [*Bédaride's Jews in France*, &c.], 381—407.
Septuagint [*H. Churton's Prize Essay*, &c.], 109—112.
Sibylline Oracles, the [*Edited by Friedlieb*, &c.], 277—296.

W.

Washington [see *Burke*].
Watson, Joshua [*Memoirs of*, edited by Churton], 23—49.
West, Patriarchs of the [*Gosse's History of the Jews*], 50—72.
Western Church, Studies of the [*Gams, Gorres*, &c.], 408—440.

N N

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

OCTOBER—Prince Albert de Broglie's Questions de Religion et d'Histoire—Stobart's Daily Services for Christian Households—Rev. A. J. D. D'Orsey's Lecture on the Study of the English Language—Forbes's Edition of S. Gregory Nyssen—Skinner's Sermon, The Church in the Public School—Bright's History of the Church, from A.D. 313 to 451—Amendments in the Book of Common Prayer, prepared by the Committee of the Liturgical Amendment Society—The further Revision of the Liturgy with re-

ference to 'Essays and Reviews,' &c.—Flower's Translation of S. Bernard's Sermons on the Church Seasons—Miss Emily Beaufort's Egyptian Sepulchres and Egyptian Shrines—Dr. M'Caul's Some Notes on the First Chapter of Genesis—Recent Recollections of the Anglo-American Church in the United States, by a Layman—Professor Goldwin Smith's Irish History and the Irish Character—Lyne's Two Letters, Vindiciæ Veteris Testamenti, and Eternity of Future Punishment.

c.—
Ser-
nily
ryp-
on
col-
h in
ssor
rish
icise
ture